Submitted to *Operations Research*
manuscript (Please, provide the manuscript number!)

arXiv:1611.10191v1 [cs.GT] 30 Nov 2016

Is Non-Neutrality Profitable for the Stakeholders of the Internet Market?

Mohammad Hassan Lotfi
Department of ESE, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, lotfm@seas.upenn.edu

Saswati Sarkar
Department of ESE, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, swati@seas.upenn.edu

George Kesidis
Department of EECS, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802 gik2@psu.edu

We consider a system in which there exists two ISPs, one "big" Content Provider (CP), and a continuum of End-Users (EUs). One of the ISPs is neutral and the other is non-neutral. We consider that the CP can differentiate between ISPs by controlling the quality of the content she is offering on each one. We also consider that EUs have different levels of innate preferences for ISPs. We formulate a sequential game, and explicitly characterize all the possible Sub-game Perfect Nash Equilibria (SPNE) of the game. We prove that if an SPNE exists, it would be one of the five possible strategies each of which we explicitly characterize. We prove that when EUs have sufficiently low innate preferences for ISPs, a unique SPNE exists in which the neutral ISP would be driven out of the market. We also prove that when these preferences are sufficiently high, there exists a unique SPNE with a non-neutral outcome in which both ISPs are active. Numerical results reveal that the neutral ISP receives a lower payoff and the non-neutral ISP receives a higher payoff (most of the time) in a non-neutral scenario. However, we identify scenarios in which the non-neutral ISP loses payoff by adopting non-neutrality. We also show that a non-neutral regime yields a higher welfare for EUs in comparison to a neutral one if the market power of the non-neutral ISP is small, the sensitivity of EUs (respectively, the CP) to the quality is low (respectively, high), or a combinations of these factors.

Key words: Net Neutrality, Internet, Sequential Game

History:

1. Introduction

1.1. Motivation

Net-neutrality on the Internet is the set of policies that prevents a paid or unpaid discrimination by ISPs among different types of transmitted data. Since January 2014, when a federal appeals court struck down parts of the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) rules for net-neutrality [Wyatt (14 Jan. 2014)], the net-neutrality debate has received more attention. In February 2015, the FCC reclassified the Internet as a utility [Ruiz and Lohr (26 Feb. 2015)], providing the grounds for this agency to secure even stricter net-neutrality rules. However, this will not be the end of the net-neutrality debates. Further actions, from ISPs and Content Providers (CPs), are expected, since both may have incentives to adopt a non-neutral regime. For example, some CPs are willing to pay for a premium quality by which they can increase the usage, the satisfaction, or the number of their subscribers [Lotfi et al. (2015)]. On the other hand, ISPs can increase their profit by charging CPs for a premium quality. In addition, the net-neutrality issue is not restricted to the U.S. For example, in October 2015, the European parliament has rejected legal amendments for strict net-neutrality rules, and passed a set of rules that allow for sponsored data plans and Internet fast lanes for "specialized services" [Vincent (27 Oct. 2015)].

Net-neutrality rules are often considered to be vague. For example, in February 2014, Comcast and Netflix negotiated a contract in which Netflix would pay Comcast for a faster access to Comcast's subscribers [Wyatt and Cohen (23 Feb. 2014)]. Both parties announced that the contract is a peering agreement, and its goal is to resolve the traffic imbalance. However, after deploying the agreement, the average Netflix download speed improved significantly [Seward (27 Aug. 2014)]. Note that a contract for resolving *aggregate* traffic imbalance at tier-1 ties (particularly between an "eyeball" ISP and one serving a CP) in which the party receiving the net traffic imbalance get paid is considered "neutral" [Kocak et al. (Sept. 2013), Kesidis (May 2014)]. Thus, although the Netflix-Comcast deal does not violate the net-neutrality rules, it has a non-neutral outcome of a side-payment between a residential ISP and a CP. This reveals a net-neutrality loophole at tier-1 ties Service Level Agreements (SLAs).

1.2. Related Works

This work falls in the category of economic models for a non-neutral Internet [Schuett (2010)]. This line of work can be divided into two broad categories: those that consider a non-neutral regime in which (a) a non-neutral ISP blocks the content of the CPs that do not pay the side-payment, examples are Economides and Tag (2012), Njoroge et al. (2010), Lotfi et al. (2014), and those that consider (b) a non-neutral ISP that provides quality differentiations for CPs and do not necessarily block a content, examples are Ma and Misra (2013), Maillé and Schwartz (2016), Krämer and Wiewiorra (2012), Pil Choi and Kim (2010), Cheng et al. (2011), Musacchio et al. (2009), Altman et al. (2011), Hanawal and Altman (2013), Choi et al. (2015), Bourreau et al. (2015). Note that in reality and because of FCC restrictions on blocking the content, we expect the latter scenario (differentiation in quality) to emerge. Thus, in this work, we consider the second scenario.

These works can also be further divided into two other categories: (i) those that consider monopolistic ISPs: Maillé and Schwartz (2016), Krämer and Wiewiorra (2012), Pil Choi and Kim (2010), Cheng et al. (2011), Hermalin and Katz (2007), Musacchio et al. (2009), Altman et al. (2011), and (ii) those that consider competition between ISPs: Ma and Misra (2013), Economides and Tag (2012), Njoroge et al. (2010), Hanawal and Altman (2013), Choi et al. (2015), Bourreau et al. (2015), Lotfi et al. (2014). Our work belongs to the latter case.

Note that in reality, at initial stages of migration to a non-neutral regime, *some ISPs would adopt a non-neutral regime before others*. Thus, we need to consider a model in which some of the ISPs are neutral and some are non-neutral. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is one of the few works that considers the problem of migration to a non-neutral regime. The focus of previous works is on the social welfare analysis of the market when all ISPs are neutral and/or all are non-neutral, without considering the incentives of individual ISPs to adopt a non-neutral regime. The excpetion is Ma and Misra (2013) in which the authors consider competition between a neutral (public option) ISP with non-neutral ISPs. They argue that the existence of a neutral ISP increases the customer surplus in comparison to a neutral scenario in which all ISPs are neutral. Contrary

to their results, we show that the competition between the neutral and non-neutral ISPs would not always increase the customers welfare. The reason for the differences between these results lies in the differences in the models of the two paper. We show that different market powers of ISPs and the sensitivity of EUs and CPs to the quality of the content are important factors in determining the welfare of EUs. These factors are absent in the model of Ma and Misra (2013).

In addition, in contrast to the previous works, we consider competition between ISPs that have different market powers, i.e. an asymmetric competition (Market power is the ability of a decision maker to raise the market price for a good or service.). Moreover, in most of the previous works, CPs have a passive role, i.e. they are only price-takers. However, in our model, we consider the quality of the content that a CP offers for EUs of each ISP as the strategy by which she can influence the equilibrium of the market. For example, a CP can select a particular ISP and offer with a high quality on this ISP, and stop offering her content on other ISPs. By doing so, the CP might be able to migrate EUs of other ISPs to the selected ISP.

Some of the preliminary results and ideas of this work were presented in Lotfi et al. (2016).

1.3. Contributions

We model the interaction between ISPs and CPs in a non-neutral regime in the presence of *asymmetric* competition between ISPs when some of the ISPs are non-neutral and some are neutral. In addition, we consider CPs that can differentiate between ISPs by controlling the quality of the content they are offering on each one. We consider a diverse set of parameters for the market, e.g. market powers of ISPs, sensitivity of EUs and the CP to the quality of the content. The goal is to obtain founded insights on whether there exists a market equilibrium, the structure of the equilibria, and how they depend on different parameters of the market when the current equilibrium (neutral regime) is disrupted and some ISPs have switched to a non-neutral regime. Insights from our work can be used by the regulator in designing efficient rules for the Internet market.

1.4. Model and Formulation

We consider the market with two ISPs, one neutral and one non-neutral. This can represent two *groups* of ISPs, neutral and non-neutral, that are competing against each other. We also consider a "big" CP with high market power that chooses her strategies to influence the equilibrium outcome of the market. All other CPs are considered to be passive in the equilibrium selection process, and their effects are modeled using a common factor in the utility of End-Users (EUs). In addition, we consider a continuum of EUs that decide on the ISP they want to buy Internet subscription from. We assume that EUs have different levels of innate preferences for each ISP which can be because of initial set-up costs of a new service upon switching the ISP or the reluctancy of EUs to change the existing ISP. These innate preferences capture the degree by which EUs are locked in with a particular ISP. Market powers of ISPs are defined as a function of these innate preferences.

In our model, both ISPs offer a free service for CPs up to a threshold on quality. In addition, the non-neutral ISP offers a premium quality in exchange of a side payment from the CP. This side-payment can be negative or positive, where a negative side-payment means a net payment from the non-neutral ISP to the CP. For instance, a negative side payment can arise in a scenario that the non-neutral ISP wants to make sure that the monopolistic CP offers with a premium quality and exclusively for her EUs. We assume that the CP generates revenue through advertisements, and the advertisement profit of the CP is an increasing function of the quality she offers to EUs.

We formulate a four-stage sequential game and seek the Sub-game Perfect Nash Eequilibrium (SPNE) of the sequential game using backward induction.

Note that the equilibrium outcome has a complex dependency on a wide range of parameters. Thus, the structure, the existence and the uniqueness of the equilibrium is not apriori clear. One can expect different equilibrium outcomes in which either (i) the CP offers her content only with a free (best effort) quality, or (ii) the CP offers her content with free quality on the neutral and with premium quality on the non-neutral ISP, or (iii) the CP offers with a premium quality only on the non-neutral ISP. Moreover, different equilibrium Internet access fees and side payments can be

selected by the ISPs whose value directly affects the welfare of EUs. For example, the non-neutral ISP can select a small Internet access fee to increase the number of her EUs and generates most of her revenue through the side-payment she charges the CP. In this case, because of competition, the neutral ISP should decrease her Internet access fee. Thus, the welfare of EUs would be high. Or, the non-neutral ISP may select a small side-payment (possibly negative) to make sure that the CP offers with a premium quality, and generate her revenue by increasing Internet access fees for EUs, which enables the neutral ISP to increase her price for EUs. Thus, this scenario yields a small welfare for EUs. Note that equilibrium outcomes determine the division of EUs between ISPs, and some divisions maybe more desirable for the CP. Thus, the CP can have an active role in choosing the desirable equilibrium outcome (as well as the division of EUs with ISPs) by controlling the quality of her content on each ISP appropriately.

1.5. Analytical Results

We show that if an SPNE exists, it would be one of the five possible strategies each of which we explicitly characterize. In some of these strategies, the CP offers her content on only the non-neutral ISP, and in the rest she offers her content on both ISPs. In addition, in one of the outcomes, all EUs pay the Internet access fee to the non-neutral ISP, i.e. the neutral ISP is driven out of the market. However, in the rest, both ISPs receive a positive share of EUs, i.e. both ISPs are active. In addition, by providing specific instances, we shows that an SPNE does not always exist.

We prove that when EUs have sufficiently low *inertia* for ISPs, i.e. when the preferences are "relatively" small and do not over rule major discrepancies on price and quality, the game has a unique SPNE. In this SPNE, the CP offers her content with premium quality on the non-neutral ISP while she does not offer her content on the neutral ISP, to attract all EUs to the non-neutral ISP on which users can receive a better quality. Thus, the neutral ISP would be driven out of the market. This implies that when inertias are small, upon switching to a non-neutral regime by an ISP, the neutral ISPs are forced to either leave the market or adopt a non-neutral regime.

We also consider the case that EUs have sufficiently high inertia for at least one of the ISPs, and EUs cannot easily switch between ISPs. This case often happens in practice in the Internet market, e.g. when ISPs bundle Internet access with other services (e.g. cable, phone). In this case, an EU may incur additional expenses for other services if she buys Internet access from another ISP. Another example of high inertia of EUs is the case in which EUs require different devices to access the Internet through different ISPs (e.g. different devices for cable and DSL services), i.e. high set up costs. We prove that there exists a unique SPNE with a non-neutral outcome, and we explicitly characterize the SPNE. In the unique SPNE, both ISPs are active, and the CP offers her content with free quality on the neutral ISP and with premium quality on the non-neutral ISP.

In addition, we consider a benchmark case in which both ISPs are neutral. In this case, we prove that there exists a unique SPNE, in which the CP offers her content over both ISPs with free quality, and both ISPs would be active. We use the results of this case as a benchmark for assessing the extent of benefit of switching to non-neutrality for different entities of the market.

1.6. Numerical Results

Numerical results confirm our theoretical results that when the inertias of EUs for ISPs are small (respectively, high) enough, then the SPNE (respectively, the SPNE with a non-neutral outcome) exists and is unique. Numerical results also help pinpoint which of the five possible SPNE strategies occurs when the inertias are between these two extreme cases (high and low inertias). More specifically, results yield that if the inertia are between these two extreme cases but still on the lower end of the region in between, the game has an SPNE outcome in which both ISPs are active, but the CP offers her content with premium quality and only on the non-neutral ISP. Results also reveal that if the inertia are between the two extreme cases but on the upper end of the region in between, then the game has no SPNE. Results of simulation over large sets of parameters also suggest that in all scenarios, the SPNE is unique if it were to exist.

Numerical results reveal that the neutral ISP loses payoff in all SPNE outcomes in comparison to the benchamrk case. In addition, for a wide range of parameters, the non-neutral ISP receives

a better payoff under a non-neutral scenario. This implies that it is beneficial for ISPs to operate as non-neutral, if they have the choice. However, switching to a non-neutral regime is *not* always profitable for ISPs. If EUs or the CP are not sensitive to the quality of the content delivered and the market power of the non-neutral ISP is small, then ISPs are better off staying neutral.

Results also reveal that the sensitivity of the EUs and the CP, and the market power of ISPs substantially influences the welfare of EUs (EUW) in neutral and non-neutral scenarios. The EUW would be higher in a non-neutral setting (as compared to the neutral setting) if (i) the market power of the non-neutral ISP is low, (ii) the sensitivity of the CP to the quality is high, or (iii) EUs are not very sensitive to the quality, or a combination of these conditions. In these cases a cheaper Internet access fee would be charged to the EUs by the non-neutral ISP which yields a higher EUW. In the absence of these conditions, the EUW of the neutral scenario would be higher.

1.7. Organization of the Paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 2, we present the model. Then, we find the SPNE(s) strategies in Section 3. In Section 4, we present the results for the benchmark case, i.e. both ISPs neutral. In Section 5, we summarize and discuss about the key results of the paper. We provide numerical examples in Section 6. Finally, we comment on some of the assumptions of the model and their generalizations in Section 7. All proofs are presented in the Appendices.

2. Model and Formulations

We consider two ISPs, a CP, and a continuum of EUs.

ISPs:

We consider one of the ISPs to be neutral (ISP N) and the other to be non-neutral (ISP NoN), i.e. the latter can offer a premium quality for CPs in exchange of a side-payment. The strategies of the neutral and non-neutral ISPs are to determine Internet access fees for EUs, i.e. p_N and p_{NoN}, respectively. We show that most of the results will depend on the difference in the Internet access fees, i.e. $\Delta p := p_{NoN} - p_N$.

In addition, the non-neutral ISP determines $\tilde{p}$, i.e. the side-payment per quality. Note that $\tilde{p}$ can be positive or negative, in which a negative side-payment implies a reverse flow of money from the non-neutral ISP to the CP. The CP will pay premium quality fee, i.e. the side-payment, to the non-neutral ISP if she chooses to offer a quality higher than the free quality threshold ($\tilde{q}_f$), and can offer with up to the quality $\tilde{q}_f$ for free on both ISPs. The side-payment paid to the non-neutral ISP is considered to be a linear function of the quality. Thus,

$$\text{Side Payment} = \begin{cases} \tilde{p}q \text{ if } q > \tilde{q}_f \\ 0 \quad \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We assume that the neutral ISP generates her profit from EUs, and the non-neutral generates her profit from EUs and potentially from the CP (if $\tilde{p} > 0$ and the CP is willing to pay for a premium quality). The payoff of the neutral and non-neutral ISPs are as follows:

$$\pi_N(p_N) = (p_N - c)n_N \qquad \& \qquad \pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}, p_{NoN}) = (p_{NoN} - c)n_{NoN} + z\tilde{p}q_{NoN} \tag{1}$$

where n_N and n_{NoN} are the fraction of EUs that have access to Internet via the neutral and non-neutral ISPs, respectively. The parameter q_{NoN} is the quality of the content on the non-neutral ISP, and c is the marginal cost of providing Internet for EUs. The parameter z indicates whether the CP chooses to offer her content with premium quality (z=1 when the CP offers with premium quality, and $z = 0$ otherwise). From (1), for a positive payoff, $p_N \geq c$, and $p_{NoN} \geq c$, if $z = 0$. However, if $z = 1$, there may exist cases that even with $p_{NoN} < c$, the payoff of ISP NoN would be positive.

The CP:

The CP can potentially offer different quality levels on different ISPs. The strategy of the CP is to choose a quality of $q_N \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$ on the neutral ISP, and a quality of $q_{NoN} \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p\}$ on the non-neutral ISP, with $\Delta q := q_{NoN} - q_N$. In our model, the CP generates revenue through advertisement. We also assume that the advertising profit that the CP receives is a function of the number of EUs and the content quality she delivers to these EUs (Endnote 1.). Thus, the advertising profit is proportional to q_N and q_{NoN} (As seen in the first two terms of (2)). In addition, the CP pays (or

receive if $\tilde{p} < 0$) a side-payment to the non-neutral ISP based on the side-payment per quality fee determined by the non-neutral ISP and the quality. Thus, the profit of the CP is,

$$\pi_{CP}(q_N, q_{NoN}, z) = n_N \kappa_{ad} q_N + n_{NoN} \kappa_{ad} q_{NoN} - z\tilde{p} q_{NoN} \tag{2}$$

where κ_{ad} is a constant (Endnote 2.), $z = 0$ if $q_{NoN} = \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$ (using free quality) and $z = 1$ if $q_{NoN} = \tilde{q}_p$ (using premium quality).

It may appear from (2) that the CP would lose nothing by choosing at least a free quality on both ISPs. However, this is not the case. As we explain later, n_N and n_{NoN} are dependent on q_N and q_{NoN}, and there is a negative correlation between them. In other words, increasing one of them (e.g. n_N), decreases the other one (e.g. n_{NoN}). Therefore, the CP may stop offering her content on the neutral ISP to move EUs to the non-neutral ISP on which they can receive a better quality. This may lead to higher advertisement revenues for the CP.

End-Users:

The strategy of an EU is to choose one of the ISPs to buy Internet access from. We assume that the neutral ISP is located at 0, the non-neutral one is located at 1, and EUs are distributed uniformly along the unit interval $[0, 1]$. The closer an EU to an ISP, the more this EU prefers this ISP to the other. Note that the notion of closeness and distance is used to model the preference of EUs and market power of ISPs, and may not be the same as the physical distance.

More formally, the EU located at $x \in [0, 1]$ incurs a *transport cost* of $t_N x$ (respectively, $t_{NoN}(1 - x)$) when joining the neutral ISP (respectively, non-neutral ISP), where t_N (respectively, t_{NoN}) is the marginal transport cost for the neutral (respectively, non-neutral) ISP. Two possible interpretations of the transport costs are reluctancy of EUs to change their ISP and initial set-up costs of a new service upon switching the ISP. In sum, we consider t_N and t_{NoN} as the reluctancy of EUs for connecting to the neutral and non-neutral ISPs, respectively.

We consider a common valuation for connecting to the Internet for EUs regardless of the content of the CP. This common valuation also models the valuation of EUs for CPs other than the CP



Figure 1 A schematic of the market - red (solid) lines are the flow of the money and blue (dashed) lines are the flow of the content.

considered in this paper, i.e. the valuation for connecting to the Internet regardless of the status of the CP considered. Let v^* denote this common valuation. The overall valuation of an EU located at $x \in [0,1]$ for connecting to the Internet via the neutral ISP (respectively, non-neutral ISP) is considered to be $v^* + \kappa_u q_N - t_N x$ (respectively, $v^* + \kappa_u q_{NoN} - t_{NoN}(1-x)$). Thus, the utility of an EU who connects to the ISP $j \in \{N, NoN\}$ located at distance x_j of the ISP, and is receiving the content with quality q_j, is:

$$u_{EU,j}(x_j) = v^* + \kappa_u q_j - t_j x_j - p_j, \quad j \in \{N, NoN\} \tag{3}$$

This model is generally known as the hotelling model. A symmetric version ($t_N = t_{NoN}$) of this model is used in the context of the Internet market in Bourreau et al. (2015).

Note that the lower t_N and t_{NoN}, the easier EUs can switch between ISPs, and thus the lower would be the *inertia* of EUs. Therefore, high transport cost for an ISP is associated with EUs that are locked in with the other ISP. We consider the ratio of t_N and t_{NoN} as the relative bias of EUs for ISPs. More specifically, the higher $\frac{t_N}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$ (respectively, $\frac{t_{NoN}}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$), the higher the bias of EUs for connecting to the Internet via ISP NoN (respectively, ISP N). We define the market power of an ISP to be the relative biases, i.e. the market power of the neutral and non-neutral ISPs are $\frac{t_{NoN}}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$ and $\frac{t_N}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$, respectively.

A schematic of the market is presented in Figure 1.

Formulations:

We assume that ISPs are the leaders of the game, and the CP and EUs are followers. Thus, the sequence of the game is as follows:

1. The neutral and non-neutral ISPs determine Internet access fees for EUs (p_N and p_{NoN}).
2. The non-neutral ISP announces the premium quality fee side-payment ($\tilde{p}$).
3. The CP decides on the quality of the content (q_N and q_{NoN}) for EUs of each ISP.
4. EUs decide which ISP to join.

We assumed the selection of Internet access fees to happen before the selection of the side-payment because of the rate of change in these selections. Note that the Internet access fees are expected to be kept constant for a longer time horizons in comparison to the side-payment that is expected to change more frequently depending on the demand and the network specifications.

In the sequential game framework, we seek a *Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium* (SPNE) using *backward induction*.

Definition 1. *Subgame Perfect Nash Equilibrium (SPNE):* A strategy is an SPNE if and only if it constitutes a Nash Equilibrium (NE) of every subgame of the game.

Definition 2. *Backward Induction:* Characterizing the equilibrium strategies starting from the last stage of the game and proceeding backward.

We also assume that each EU chooses exactly one ISP to buy Internet access. This is known as the full market coverage of EUs by ISPs. This assumption is common in hotelling models and is necessary to ensure competition between ISPs. An equivalent assumption is to consider the common valuation v^* to be sufficiently large so that the utility of EUs for connecting to the Internet is positive regardless of the choice of ISP.

3. The Sub-Game Perfect Nash Equilibrium

In this section, we seek a sub-game perfect equilibrium using backward induction. In Sections 3.1 to 3.4, we characterize the equilibrium strategies of each stage in a reverse order starting from Stage 4. *For each stage, we assume that each decision maker is aware of the strategies chosen by other decision makers in previous stages.*

3.1. Stage 4: Customers decide which ISP to join

In this subsection, we characterize the division of EUs between ISPs in the equilibrium, i.e. n_N and n_{NoN}, using the knowledge of the strategies chosen by the ISPs and the CP in Stages 1, 2, and 3. To do so, we characterize the location of the EU that is indifferent between joining either of the ISPs, x_n. Thus, EUs located at $[0, x_n)$ join the neutral ISP, and those located at $(x_n, 1]$ joins the non-neutral ISP. The EU located at $x_n \in [0,1]$ is indifferent between connecting to the neutral and non-neutral ISP (Recall that we assumed full market coverage by ISPs) if:

$$v^* + \kappa_u q_{NoN} - t_{NoN}(1-x_n) - p_{NoN} = v^* + \kappa_u q_N - t_N x_n - p_N \Rightarrow x_n = \frac{t_{NoN} + \kappa_u(q_N - q_{NoN}) + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_{NoN} + t_N} \tag{4}$$

Thus, the fraction of EUs with each ISP (n_N and n_{NoN}) is:

$$n_N = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_n < 0 \\ \frac{t_{NoN} + \kappa_u(q_N - q_{NoN}) + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_{NoN} + t_N} & \text{if } 0 \le x_n \le 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } x_n > 1 \end{cases} \qquad \& \qquad n_{NoN} = 1 - n_N \tag{5}$$

3.2. Stage 3: The CP decides the qualities to offer over each ISP (q_N and q_{NoN})

In this section, we characterize q_N, q_{NoN} in the equilibrium using the knowledge of the vector of access fees $\vec{p} = (p_N, p_{NoN})$ and $\tilde{p}$ from stages 1 and 2. Recall that $z = 1$ if $q_{NoN} > \tilde{q}_f$, and $z = 0$ otherwise. First, we find the strategies that maximize $\pi_{CP}(q_N, q_{NoN}, z)$ (2). Then, using appropriate tie-breaking assumptions, we characterize the equilibrium strategies in Theorems 1 and 2.

Note that the CP maximizes (2) by choosing the optimum strategies, (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*), from the sets F_0 or F_1:

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= \{(0,0), (0,\tilde{q}_f), (\tilde{q}_f, 0), (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f)\} \\ F_1 &= \{(0,\tilde{q}_p), (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p)\} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Note that F_0 and F_1 are the set of strategies by which $z = 0$ and $z = 1$, respectively. Each of the sets F_0 and F_1 is further divided into three subsets, F_i^L, F_i^I, and F_i^U, for $i \in \{0,1\}$, depending on whether $x_N \le 0$, $0 < x_N < 1$, or $x_N \ge 1$ (using (4)). Since x_N is a function of q_N and q_{NoN}, these

	Conditions			
	$x_N \leq 0$ $\left(q_{NoN} - q_N \geq \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}\right)$ All EUs join Non-neutral	$0 < x_N < 1$ $\left(\frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u} < q_{NoN} - q_N < \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}\right)$ EUs divide between both ISPs	$x_N \geq 1$ $\left(q_{NoN} - q_N \leq \frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u}\right)$ All EUs join Neutral	Union ($\bigcup$)
$z=0$	F_0^L	F_0^I	F_0^U	F_0
$z=1$	F_1^L	F_1^I	F_1^U	F_1
Union ($\bigcup$)	F^L	F^I	F^U	$\mathcal{F}$

Table 1 Notations for different subsets of the feasible set. Expressions in parenthesis are equivalent form of the conditions, e.g. $x_N \leq 0 \iff q_{NoN} - q_N \geq \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$.

conditions on x_N lead to constraints on q_N and q_{NoN}. In Table 1, we present the division of the feasible set into the above-mentioned subsets and the constraints on q_N and q_{NoN} for each subset. Note that $F_0^L \cup F_1^L = F^L$, $F_0^I \cup F_1^I = F^I$, and $F_0^U \cup F_1^U = F^U$.

Next, we present the tie-breaking assumptions used to prove these results (Section 3.2.1). Then, we present the statement of the main results in Section 3.2.2. We prove the results in Appendix A.

3.2.1. Tie- Breaking Assumptions We assume that for choosing the equilibrium strategy, the CP uses the following tie-breaking assumptions that one can expect to arise in practice.

First note that $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$ (respectively, $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$) yields that $n_N^* = 0$ (respectively, $n_{NoN}^* = 0$). Thus, in this case, the quality that the CP offers on the neutral ISP (respectively, non-neutral ISP) is of no importance. Therefore:

ASSUMPTION 1. *If $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$ (respectively, $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$), then without loss of generality, $q_N^* = 0$ (respectively, $q_{NoN}^* = 0$).*

In addition, in practice, it is natural to expect that the CP prefer higher qualities to lower ones, e.g. $z=1$ over $z=0$, if this selection does not affect the payoff.

ASSUMPTION 2. *If the optimum solutions exist in F_0 and F_1, then the CP chooses the ones in F_1. In other words, if $z=1$ and $z=0$ yield equal maximum payoffs for the CP, then the CP will pick $z=1$, i.e. will use the premium quality.*

The following tie-breaking assumptions are based on the natural assumption that the CP would prefer to diversify her content over different ISPs if she is indifferent:

ASSUMPTION 3. *If there exists global optimum solutions in F^I, then they are preferred by the CP over global optimum solutions in F^L and F^U. In other words, if the outcome in which only one ISP is operating and the outcome by which both ISPs are operating yield the global maximum payoff for the CP, then the CP chooses the strategies by which the latter outcome occurs.*

ASSUMPTION 4. *Consider two strategies: (i) (q'_N, q'_{NoN}) such that at least one of q'_N or q'_{NoN} is zero, and (ii) (q''_N, q''_{NoN}) such that $q''_N > 0$ and $q''_{NoN} > 0$. If these two strategies yield the same payoff for the CP, then the CP chooses (ii), i.e. the one with positive quality on both ISPs.*

In the following tie-breaking assumption, we assume that the CP takes into the account the welfare of EUs for tie-breaking between strategies.

ASSUMPTION 5. *If the payoff of the CP when only the neutral ISP is operating is equal to the payoff when only the non-neutral is operating, then the CP prefers the strategy by which the ISP that offers the lower Internet access fee, i.e. $p_i, \quad i \in \{N, NoN\}$, is operating. In other words, the CP chooses the strategy that yields a higher social welfare for EUs.*

The above-mentioned assumptions over-ride each other in the order specified. For example, if two strategies one in F_1^L and the other in F_0^I are both global maximum, then Assumption 2 suggests that the CP chooses the strategy in F_1^L, and Assumption 3 suggests that the CP chooses the strategy in F_0^I. Since Assumption 2 comes before Assumption 3, the CP chooses the strategy in F_0^L. Next, using these tie-breaking assumptions, we characterize the equilibrium strategies:

3.2.2. Main Results First, we define certain thresholds that appear in the results:

DEFINITION 3.
- $\tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$
- $\tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, where $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$.
- $\tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad} n_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, where $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$.
- $\Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$

We would observe that, when characterizing the optimum strategies, $\tilde{p}_{t,1}$, $\tilde{p}_{t,2}$, and $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ would be thresholds on side-payment, and Δp_t would be a threshold on the difference in the access fees.

In Theorem 1, we characterize the equilibrium strategies of the CP by which $z^{eq}=0$ for different values of Δp. Then, using these results, in Theorem 2, we characterize the equilibrium strategies of the CP in general case for different regions of Δp.

THEOREM 1. *If* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0$, *then:*

1. if $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$, *then* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I$.

2. if $\Delta p \geq t_N$, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^U$.

3. if $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$.

In addition, the utility of the CP by each candidate equilibrium strategy is $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$.

For proving this theorem, we characterize optimums strategies among all $(q_N, q_{NoN}) \in F_0$. Then, using these optimum strategies and tie-breaking assumptions, we characterize (q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}). Later, we will see that this theorem also characterizes the optimum strategies of the CP in the benchmark case in which both ISPs are forced to be neutral.

Intuitively, as Δp increases, the number of EUs with ISP NoN decreases. Thus, as the results of Theorem 1 confirms, as Δp increases, the outcome of the market moves from F_0^L, i.e. all EUs join ISP NoN, to F_0^I, i.e. both ISPs have positive share of EUs, and to F_0^U, i.e. all EUs join the ISP N.

In Theorem 2, we characterize the equilibrium strategy of the CP in general case. We prove that results are threshold-type: when the side-payment, i.e. $\tilde{p}$, is less than a threshold, the CP chooses the premium quality, i.e. $z^{eq}=1$, and when $\tilde{p}$ is higher than the threshold, $z^{eq}=0$ and the CP chooses the strategies according to Theorem 1. We also characterize the value of this thresholds for different regions of Δp. Note that as Δp increases, the number of EUs with ISP NoN decreases. This affects the payoff of the CP, and subsequently the value of the side-payment that ISP NoN charges to the CP. Thus, the value of the threshold on the side-payment depends on Δp.

THEOREM 2. *Let the thresholds* Δp_t, $\tilde{p}_{t,1}$, $\tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *and* $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ *as characterized in Definition 3, then:*

1. *If* $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$*:*

- *if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,1}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$, *and* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^L$.
- *if* $\tilde{p} > \tilde{p}_{t,1}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 0$, *and* q_N^{eq} *and* q_{NoN}^{eq} *are determined by Theorem 1.*

2. *If* $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, *and* $\tilde{q}_f \leq \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$*:*

   (a) *if* $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$, *and:*

      i. *if* $\Delta p \geq \Delta p_t$*:*

- *if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,3}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$ *and* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$.
- *if* $\tilde{p} > \tilde{p}_{t,3}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 0$, *and* q_N^{eq} *and* q_{NoN}^{eq} *are determined by Theorem 1.*

      ii. *if* $\Delta p < \Delta p_t$*:*

- *if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$ *and* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$.
- *if* $\tilde{p} > \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 0$, *and* q_N^{eq} *and* q_{NoN}^{eq} *are determined by Theorem 1.*

   (b) *if* $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \leq \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$*:*

      i. *if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$, *and* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$.

      ii. *if* $\tilde{p} > \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 0$, *and* q_N^{eq} *and* q_{NoN}^{eq} *are determined by Theorem 1.*

3. *If* $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, *and* $\tilde{q}_f > \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$*:*

   (a) *if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$, *and* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$.

   (b) *if* $\tilde{p} > \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 0$, *and* q_N^{eq} *and* q_{NoN}^{eq} *are determined by Theorem 1.*

4. *If* $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, *then* $z^{eq} = 0$, *and* q_N^{eq} *and* q_{NoN}^{eq} *are determined by Theorem 1.*

Note that the thresholds $\tilde{p}_{t,1}$, $\tilde{p}_{t,2}$, and $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ are decreasing with respect to $\frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p}$. Thus, as theorem implies, the higher $\frac{\tilde{q}_p}{\tilde{q}_f}$, the higher would be the threshold on $\tilde{p}$ after which the CP chooses the free quality over the premium one. In addition, with high $\tilde{q}_p$ and low t_{NoN}, the CP prefers to choose the strategy by which the neutral ISP is driven out of the market.

3.3. Stage 2: ISP NoN determines the side-payment, $\tilde{p}$:

In this stage, ISP NoN chooses the equilibrium strategy $\tilde{p} = \tilde{p}^{eq}$, with the knowledge of p_{NoN} and p_N, to maximize her payoff:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}) = (p_{NoN} - c) n_{NoN} + z \tilde{p} q_{NoN} \tag{7}$$

First, we introduce a tie-breaking assumption (Assumption 6) for ISP NoN. In Theorem 3, we characterize the necessary and sufficient condition on $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ by which $z^{eq}=1$, i.e. the CP chooses the premium quality. Subsequently, in Theorem 4, we characterize $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ by which $z^{eq}=1$. Note that if $z^{eq}=0$, (7) would be independent of $\tilde{p}$. Thus, we only need to characterize $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ by which $z^{eq}=1$. The proofs of theorems are presented in Appendix B.

The following tie-breaking assumption for ISP NoN is used to determine the optimum strategy in this stage. In this tie-breaking assumption, we assume that because of legal complexities of a non-neutral regime, whenever ISP NoN is indifferent between $z^{eq}=0$ and $z^{eq}=1$, she chooses $\tilde{p}$ such that $z^{eq}=0$, i.e. choosing neutrality over non-neutrality (Endnote 3.).

ASSUMPTION 6. *If $\tilde{p}_1$ by which $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})\in F_1$, i.e. $z^{eq}=1$, and $\tilde{p}_2$ by which $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})\in F_0$ yield the same payoff for ISP NoN, this ISP chooses $\tilde{p}_2$, i.e. the one that yields $z^{eq}=0$.*

Recall that in Definition 3, we characterized some threshold values for the side payment. For each value of Δp, the actual threshold on the side payment is equal to one of the thresholds characterized. We define and characterize the actual threshold, i.e. $\tilde{p}_t$, based on the results in Theorem 2:

DEFINITION 4. We define $\tilde{p}_t=\tilde{p}_{t,1}$ if conditions of item 1 of Theorem 2 is met, $\tilde{p}_t=\tilde{p}_{t,2}$ if the conditions of items 2-a-ii, 2-b, and 3 of Theorem 2 is met, and $\tilde{p}_t=\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ if the conditions of the item 2-a-i of Theorem 2 is met. Note that $\tilde{p}_{t,1}$, $\tilde{p}_{t,2}$, and $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ are characterized in Definition 3, respectively.

The following Theorem characterizes a necessary and sufficient condition on $\tilde{p}_t$ by which $z^{eq}=1$.

THEOREM 3. *$z^{eq}=1$ if and only if $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p}_t)>\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ and $\Delta p<t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, where $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ is the payoff of ISP NoN when $z^{eq}=0$.*

The theorem implies that Δp being less than a threshold and the existence of $\tilde{p}$ by which the payoff of ISP NoN is greater than the payoff of this ISP when $z=0$ are necessary and sufficient conditions for $z^{eq}=1$. The reason for the former is explained after Theorem 4. The latter follows from the fact that, if the payoff of ISP NoN is not greater than the payoff of this ISP when $z=0$,

in an NE strategy, ISP would not choose $\tilde{p}$ such that $z^{eq}=1$, since the strategy of choosing an extremely large $\tilde{p}$ by which $z=0$ yields a better payoff.

In the following theorem, we characterize $\tilde{p}$ chosen by ISP NoN by which $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_1$, and also necessary conditions for $\tilde{p}$ by which $z^{eq}=1$.

THEOREM 4. *If $z^{eq}=1$, then $\tilde{p}^{eq}=\tilde{p}_t$, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p}_t) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})$, and $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, where $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ is the payoff of ISP NoN when $z^{eq}=0$.*

Thus, the necessary conditions are: (i) in each region, $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ is the maximum side payment by which the CP chooses $z^{eq}=1$, i.e. the threshold defined in Definition 4, (ii) the payoff of ISP NoN with $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ should be strictly larger than the payoff when $z^{eq}=0$, and (iii) Δp should be smaller than a threshold (if not the number of EUs on ISP NoN would be zero, and trivially the CP does not offer her content on this ISP).

REMARK 1. Note that, if $z^{eq}=0$, then the payoff of ISP NoN (1) is independent of $\tilde{p}$. Thus, $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ is independent of $\tilde{p}$.

3.4. Stage 1: ISPs determine p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq}:

First, in Theorem 5, we prove that if inertias are small, then there is no NE by which $z^{eq}=0$. Then, in Theorem 6, we characterize the NE strategies by which $z^{eq}=1$ for the case that the inertias are small. In Theorem 6, we prove that if inertias are sufficiently small, then a unique NE exists. If not, only under certain conditions a unique NE exists. Numerical simulations under a wide range of parameters (presented in Section 6.1) reveal that these conditions are always satisfied.

Then, we focus on the case that inertias are not small. In Theorem 7, we characterize all possible NE strategies by which $z^{eq}=1$. In Theorem 8, we prove that when one of the inertias is large, the only NE strategy by which $z^{eq}=1$ is the third candidate strategy of Theorem 7. Then, in Theorem 9, we characterize the only candidate NE strategy by which $z^{eq}=0$.

By (1) and without loss of generality, in the equilibrium, $p_N^{eq} \geq c$. In addition, if $z=0$, $p_{NoN}^{eq} \geq c$. If $0 \leq x_n \leq 1$, i.e. $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F^I$, from (5), the payoff of neutral and non-neutral ISPs are:

$$\pi_N(p_N) = (p_N - c)\frac{t_{NoN} + \kappa_u(q_N - q_{NoN}) + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}} \tag{8}$$

$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p}) = (p_{NoN}-c)\frac{t_N+\kappa_u(q_{NoN}-q_N)+p_N-p_{NoN}}{t_N+t_{NoN}} + zq_{NoN}\tilde{p} \tag{9}$$

First, given the strategies of the CP and EUs described in previous sections, we prove that if inertias are small, then there is no NE by which $z^{eq}=0$:

THEOREM 5. *If $t_N+t_{NoN}\leq\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, there is no NE by which $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})\in F_0$, i.e. $z^{eq}=0$.*

Next, we characterize the NE strategies by which $z^{eq}=1$ when inertias are small:

THEOREM 6. *If $t_N+t_{NoN}\leq\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, the NE strategies, p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq} by which $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})\in F_1$, i.e. $z^{eq}=1$, are:*

1. *$p_{NoN}^{eq}=c+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}$ and $p_N^{eq}=c$ if and only if $\tilde{q}_p\geq\frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$.*
2. *$p_{NoN}^{eq}=c+\frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ and $p_N^{eq}=c+\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ if and only if $\tilde{q}_p<\frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, and $\pi_N(p_N^{eq})\geq p_t^d-c$ where $p_t^d=\frac{\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f(t_N+t_{NoN})}{p_{NoN}^{eq}-c+\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p}+p_{NoN}^{eq}-t_{NoN}-\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$.*

We show in Corollary EC.2 that both sets of strategies are associated with the case that the CP offers with premium quality on ISP NoN and with zero quality on ISP N. In the first set, ISP N would be driven out of the market, while with the second set, ISP N would be active.

Now, we focus on the case that inertias are not small. In the following theorem, we characterize the NE strategies by which $z^{eq}=1$:

THEOREM 7. *If $\tilde{q}_p<\frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, then the only possible NE strategies by which $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})\in F_1$, i.e. $z^{eq}=1$, are:*

1. *If $\Delta p\leq\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}$, then $p_{NoN}^{eq}=c+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}$ and $p_N^{eq}=c$.*
2. *If (i) $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}<\Delta p^{eq}<\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}$ or $t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)<\Delta p^{eq}<t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, then $p_{NoN}^{eq}=c+\frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ and $p_N^{eq}=c+\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, and $\pi_{NoN}^{eq}=\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}^{eq},\tilde{p}_{t,2})$. The necessary conditions: (ii) $\tilde{q}_p\leq\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, and (iii) $\pi_{NoN}^{eq}>\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}^{eq},\tilde{p})$.*
3. *If (i) $\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}<\Delta p^{eq}<t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$, then $p_{NoN}^{eq}=c+\frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ and $p_N^{eq}=c+\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, and $\pi_{NoN}^{eq}=\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}^{eq},\tilde{p}_{t,3})$. The necessary conditions: (ii) $\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f\leq\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, and (iii) $\pi_{NoN}^{eq}>\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}^{eq},\tilde{p})$.*

4. $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c$ *and* $p^{eq}_{N} = c - \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + t_{NoN}$, *and* $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,3})$. *The necessary conditions: (i)* $2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f \leq \frac{t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ *and (ii)* $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$.

We show in Corollary EC.3 that the first two sets of strategies are associated with the case that the CP offers with premium quality on ISP NoN and with zero quality on ISP N. With the first set, ISP N would be driven out of the market, while with the second, ISP N would be active. The third and fourth sets of strategies are associated with the case that both ISPs are active and the CP offers her content with premium quality on ISP NoN and with free quality on ISP N.

Next, we prove that when either of the transport costs is large enough, then the only NE strategy by which $z^{eq} = 1$ is the third candidate strategy of the previous theorem:

THEOREM 8. *When either* t_N *or* t_{NoN} *is large enough, for the case that* $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, *the only NE strategy by which* $z^{eq} = 1$ *is* $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN} + 2t_N + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u - 2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ *and* $p^{eq}_{N} = c + \frac{2t_{NoN} + t_N - (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3}$.

REMARK 2. Note that when at least one of t_N and t_{NoN} is large, then the effect of $\tilde{q}_p$ can be ignored. Thus, this scenario can be considered to be similar to the case that both ISPs are neutral, i.e. the benchmark case. Later, in Theorem 10, we prove that a unique SPNE exists in this case, and it is similar to the NE strategies characterized in Theorem 8 with $\tilde{q}_p = \tilde{q}_f$.

Now, we characterize the equilibrium strategy by which $z^{eq} = 0$ when inertias are not small:

THEOREM 9. *If* $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, *the only possible NE strategy by which* $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) \in F_0$, *i.e.* $z^{eq} = 0$ *is* $p^{eq}_N = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N)$ *and* $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN})$. *The necessary condition for this strategy to be a candidate NE strategy is* $\pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN}, z = 0) \geq \pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_t)$.

REMARK 3. Note that the candidate strategies listed in Theorems 7 and 9 are NE if and only if the conditions listed in the theorem hold and no unilateral deviation is profitable for each ISPs.

4. Benchmark Case: A Neutral Regime

In this section, we consider a benchmark case in which both ISPs are forced to be neutral. Our goal is to find the SPNE when both ISPs are neutral. We compare the results of the benchmark

case with the results we found in the previous section. Note that we do not restrict the analysis of this section to any particular range of transport costs, and the analysis is done for a general case.

The main result of this section is Theorem 10. In order to characterize the equilibrium in this case, we can consider a simple change to our previous model and use some of the previous results. We assume that in this case, the CP chooses $z^{eq} = 0$, regardless of the strategy of ISPs. Thus, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0$, and as a result both ISPs are neutral.

Note that in this case, the equilibrium strategy of Stage 4 is similar as before, and the equilibrium strategy of Stage 3 is characterized in Theorem 1. Recall that in Theorem 1, we characterize the equilibrium strategies within F_0 without considering the strategies in F_1. In addition, note that the strategy of Stage 2 is of no importance since with $z^{eq} = 0$, the effect of $\tilde{p}$ would be eliminated in all analyses. Thus, we only need to find the new equilibrium strategies in Stage 1 of the game:

THEOREM 10. *The unique NE strategies chosen by the ISP are* $p_N^{eq} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N)$ *and* $p_{NoN}^{eq} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN})$.

5. The Outcome of the Game and Discussions

First, in Section 5.1, we summarize, discuss, and interpret the possible outcomes of the model characterized in the previous section. Then, in Section 5.2, we summarize and discuss the results for a benchmark case in which both ISPs are neutral.

5.1. Possible Outcomes of the Market

In Sections 3 and 4, we have characterized all the possible SPNE strategies. Using these strategies, we have characterized the SPNE outcomes in Appendix E. In this section, we summarize, discuss, and interpret these possible outcomes.

Candidate Outcome (a): $p_{NoN}^{eq} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, $p_N^{eq} = c$, $z^{eq} = 1$, i.e. the CP pays for the premium quality, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^L$, $n_N^{eq} = 0$, and $n_{NoN}^{eq} = 1$ (outcome associated with Theorem 6-1 and Theorem 7-1).

Note that from Theorems 5 and 6, this outcome is the unique SPNE of the game if t_N and t_{NoN} are sufficiently small, i.e. EUs are not locked-in with ISPs. This outcome represents the case

in which the CP offers the content with premium quality and pays the side-payment to the non-neutral ISP. Note that EUs can receive a better quality of content on the non-neutral ISP, and that yields a better advertisement revenue for the CP. Thus, in the equilibrium, the CP offers her content only on the non-neutral ISP to increase the number of EUs connecting to the Internet via the non-neutral ISP. By doing so, given the conditions of this candidate outcome, all EUs would join the non-neutral ISP and the neutral ISP would be driven out of the market.

In addition, note that the Internet access fee chosen by ISP NoN (p^{eq}_{NoN}) increases with (i) increasing the sensitivity of end-users to the quality (κ_u), (ii) increasing the value of the premium quality ($\tilde{q}_p$), and (iii) decreasing the transport cost of ISP NoN (t_{NoN}). Recall that t_{NoN} has an inverse relationship with the market power of ISP NoN if t_N is fixed.

Moreover, note that the side-payment charged for the premium quality ($\tilde{p}^{eq}\tilde{q}_p$) is positive, and is dependent on (i) the sensitivity of the payoff of the CP to the quality of the advertisement, i.e. κ_{ad}, and (ii) the difference between the premium and free quality, i.e. $\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f$. The latter implies that ISP NoN chooses the side-payment in proportion to the additional value created for the CP.

Candidate Outcome (b): $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, $p^{eq}_N = c + \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, $z^{eq} = 1$, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n^{eq}_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, $n^{eq}_N = \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}-\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N+t_{NoN})}$, and $n^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{2t_N+t_{NoN}+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N+t_{NoN})}$ (outcome associated with Theorem 6-2 and Theorem 7-2).

Candidate outcome (b) represents the case in which both ISPs are active. However, similar to (a), with this outcome, the CP does not offer her content over the neutral ISP, and offers her content only over the non-neutral ISP with premium quality. Thus, although the CP stops offering her content on the neutral ISP, she cannot move all EUs to ISP NoN. The loss in the number of EUs would be compensated by receiving higher advertisement revenue (due to the premium quality) and paying a lower side payment (will be explained in the associated paragraph).

It is noteworthy to observe that if t_N (respectively, t_{NoN}) increases, p^{eq}_{NoN} (respectively, p^{eq}_N) increases with a rate $\frac{2}{3}$rd the rate of the growth of this transport cost. This is intuitive. The higher t_N (while t_{NoN} fixed), the higher would be the market power of ISP NoN, and subsequently the

higher would be p^{eq}_{NoN}. In addition, counter-intuitively, p_N (respectively, p_{NoN}) also increases with a rate $\frac{1}{3}$rd of the rate of growth of t_N (respectively, t_{NoN}). This counter-intuitive result (Internet access fee of an ISP being an increasing function of the transport cost of this ISP) is because of competition between ISPs. For example, with the increase of t_{NoN}, EUs have more incentive to join the neutral ISP and less incentive to switch to the non-neutral ISP. Thus the neutral ISP can set a higher price for EUs. This allows her competitor, i.e. ISP NoN, to increases her price, but with a rate lower than the rate by which the price of ISP N increases.

In addition, note that p^{eq}_N is a decreasing function of $\tilde{q}_p$, κ_u, and κ_{ad}: The higher the premium quality or the sensitivity of EUs and the CP to the quality, the lower would be the Internet access fee of ISP N. On the other hand, the relationship between these parameters and p^{eq}_{NoN} is more complicated. The Internet access fee of ISP NoN is increasing with respect to the sensitivity of EUs to the quality, and is decreasing with respect to the sensitivity of the CP to the quality. Thus, the more the CP is sensitive to the quality, the more the ISP NoN provides subsidies for EUs (cheaper Internet access fees), and compensates the payoff through charging the CP. In addition, note that p^{eq}_{NoN} is decreasing or increasing with respect to the amount of premium quality ($\tilde{q}_p$) depending on the sensitivity of EUs and the CP to the quality: If the sensitivity of EUs to the quality dominates the sensitivity of the CP ($\kappa_u > 2\kappa_{ad}$), then p^{eq}_{NoN} is increasing with respect to $\tilde{q}_p$. If not, then ISP NoN generates more revenue from the CP, and thus provide a cheaper Internet access fee for EUs. The higher this sensitivity, the higher would be the side payment from the CP (can be seen from the expression of $\tilde{p}^{eq}$), and the higher would be the discount on the Internet access fees for EUs.

Moreover, note that the side-payment charged for the premium quality ($\tilde{p}^{eq}\tilde{q}_p$) is increasing with respect to (i) κ_{ad} (the sensitivity of the CP to the quality), (ii) the premium quality ($\tilde{q}_p$), and (iii) number of EUs with the non-neutral ISP (n^{eq}_{NoN}), and is decreasing with respect to the free quality ($\tilde{q}_f$). Note that since in this case $n_{NoN} < 1$, the side payment would be lower than the side payment in candidate outcome (a). This side-payment can be positive or negative. However, as we explain later, the numerical results reveal that the side-payment is positive whenever this candidate outcome is an SPNE.

In addition, note that n_{NoN} is increasing with respect to the premium quality, i.e. $\tilde{q}_p$, and the sensitivity of the CP and EUs to the quality, i.e. κ_u and κ_{ad}. The relationship between n_{NoN} (and thus n_N) and the transport costs, i.e. t_N and t_{NoN} is more complex and is discussed in Section 6.2.

Candidate Outcome (c): $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, $p^{eq}_{N} = c + \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, $z^{eq}=1$, $\tilde{p}^{eq}=\tilde{p}_{t,3}=\kappa_{ad}n^{eq}_{NoN}(1-\frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, $n^{eq}_N = \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N+t_{NoN})}$, and $n^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{2t_N+t_{NoN}+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N+t_{NoN})}$ (outcome associated with Theorem 7-3). Recall that in Theorem 8, we proved that when either of t_N or t_{NoN} is large, then the only candidate outcome by which $z^{eq}=1$ is (c).

Candidate outcome (c) represents the case that both ISPs are active, and the CP offers her content with free quality on the neutral ISP and with premium quality on the non-neutral one. The dependencies of the access fees (p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN}) to t_N, t_{NoN}, κ_u, and κ_{ad} are the same as what described for candidate outcome (b). In addition, note that p^{eq}_N is decreasing with the difference between the premium and free qualities, i.e. $\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f$, and p^{eq}_{NoN} is decreasing or increasing with respect to the difference in the qualities depending on the sensitivity of EUs and the CP to the quality (similar to the description for the candidate outcome (b)).

Moreover, note that the side-payment charged for the premium quality ($\tilde{p}^{eq}\tilde{q}_p$) is increasing with respect to (i) κ_{ad} (the sensitivity of the CP to the quality), (ii) the difference between the premium and free qualities ($\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f$), (iii) number of EUs with the non-neutral ISP (n^{eq}_{NoN}). This side-payment is always positive. The dependencies of n_{NoN} to the parameters are similar to what described for candidate outcome (b), with the difference that n_{NoN} depends on the difference in the qualities, i.e. $\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f$, instead of only $\tilde{q}_p$.

Note that when either of t_N or t_{NoN} is large, then (c) is the only candidate outcome by which $z^{eq}=1$. First, recall that the payoff that an ISP receives depends on both the number of EUs and the Internet connection fee of that ISP. In addition, we discussed that when either of t_N or t_{NoN} is large, then both of the Internet connection fees would be large in candidate outcomes (b) and (c). It turns out that when t_N or t_{NoN} is large, ISPs prefer candidate outcomes (b) and (c) to the outcomes by which they discount the price heavily to attract EUs ((a) and (d)).

Moreover, when both ISPs are active, large t_{NoN} or t_N decreases the effect of quality of the content on the decision of EUs (both through high transport costs and increase in the Internet access fees). Thus, the CP cannot control the number of EUs with each ISP by strategically controlling her quality. Therefore the CP simply chooses to provide with maximum possible quality on both ISPs instead of choosing strategic qualities to control the equilibrium. Thus, (c) is expected to occur.

Candidate Outcome (d): $p_{NoN}^{eq} = c,\ p_N^{eq} = c - \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + t_{NoN},\ z^{eq} = 1,\ \tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad} n_{NoN}^{eq}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p}),\ (q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I,\ n_N^{eq} = \frac{\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p}{t_N + t_{NoN}},$ and $n_{NoN}^{eq} = \frac{t_N + t_{NoN} - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$ (outcome associated with Theorem 7-4).

Candidate outcome (d) represents the scenario in which the non-neutral ISP is forced to provide a low Internet access fee for EUs. This strategy can only be valid when t_{NoN} is large (so that $p_N^{eq} \geq c$). In other words, the only scenario that this strategy is possible is when EUs are reluctant joining the non-neutral ISP. Thus, this ISP should provide large discounts for EUs. Note that in this case, both ISPs are active, and the CP offers her content over both ISPs, with free quality on the neutral ISP and with premium quality on the non-neutral one.

In this case, p_N^{eq} is decreasing with respect to κ_u and $\tilde{q}_p$, and increasing with respect to $\tilde{q}_f$ and t_{NoN}. In addition, the side payment is similar to the one in candidate outcome (c).

In this candidate outcome, p_{NoN}^{eq} is fixed, while p_N^{eq} is decreasing with respect to $\tilde{q}_p$ and κ_u. In addition, the rate of decrease of p_N^{eq} is twice of the rate of increase of utility of EUs from κ_u and $\tilde{q}_p$ when connecting to ISP NoN. Thus, The rate of increase in the utility of EUs for ISP N is higher than that of ISP NoN, and as result confirms, n_N^{eq} would be increasing with respect to the premium quality and the sensitivity of EUs to the quality. In addition, p_N^{eq} is increasing with t_{NoN}. Thus, as results confirm, n_N^{eq} would be decreasing with respect to the transport cost of ISP NoN (Endnote 4.). Finally, note that the Internet access fees are independent of t_N, but the utility of EUs connecting to neutral ISP is decreasing with t_N (3). Thus, as result confirms, the number of EUs with the neutral ISP, i.e. n_N^{eq}, is decreasing with respect to both t_N.

Candidate Outcome (e): $p_{NoN}^{eq} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN}),\ p_N^{eq} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N),\ z^{eq} = 0,$ $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L,\ n_N^{eq} = \frac{2t_{NoN} + t_N}{3(t_{NoN} + t_N)},\ n_{NoN}^{eq} = \frac{2t_N + t_{NoN}}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})},$ and since $z^{eq} = 0$, $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ is of no importance (outcome associated with Theorem 9).

This case characterizes the only possible SPNE outcome by which $z^{eq} = 0$. This outcome is similar to the benchmark one (Section 5.2). Outcome (c) would be reduced to (e), if $\tilde{q}_p = \tilde{q}_f$.

Remark: Note that candidate strategies in different theorems (defined for different regions of t_N and t_{NoN}) can be similar and yield similar outcomes, e.g. Theorem 6-1 and Theorem 7-1. In addition, there is no outcome in which the CP offers her content only on the neutral ISP. From the expression of payoff of the CP (2), the CP can get at most $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$ by offering only on the neutral ISP. On the other hand, the CP can guarantee a payoff of this amount by offering on both ISPs and $z = 0$. Assumption 4, i.e. the CP prefers to offer on both ISP whenever she is indifferent, yields that the CP never choose the strategy in which she offers only on the neutral ISP.

Interplay Between Sensitivities to Quality and the Outcome: Intuitively, we expect that high sensitivity of EUs and the CP to the quality, i.e. large κ_u and κ_{ad}, respectively, yields high payoff for the non-neutral ISP, since this ISP can provide a premium quality and charge the EUs accordingly to increase her payoff. Thus, the payoff can be collected from EUs or the CP, or both. Results reveal that in all candidate outcomes ISP NoN charges the CP in proportion to her sensitivity to the quality of the content. In addition, in candidate outcomes (a) to (c), the payoff collected from EUs through the Internet connection fees is always increasing with respect to the sensitivity of the EUs to the quality. In candidate outcomes (b) and (c), the Internet connection fees are decreasing with respect to the sensitivity of the CP to the quality. Thus, in these candidate outcomes, EUs receive a discount in proportion to the sensitivity of the CP to the quality. In candidate outcome (d), the Internet connection fee of ISP NoN does not depends on the qualities, but it is as low as the marginal cost.

Existence of NE: An SPNE may not always exist. For example, for parameters $\tilde{q}_f = 1$, $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$, $c = 1$, $\kappa_u = 1$, $\kappa_{ad} = 0.5$, $t_N = 3$, and $t_{NoN} = 2$, none of the candidate outcomes listed above would be an SPNE. The reason is that there exists a profitable deviation for at least one of the ISPs for those candidate strategies that their conditions are satisfied given these parameters. Later in Section 6.1, we identify the regions with no SPNE.

5.2. Benchmark: A Neutral Scenario

In the benchmark case, i.e. when both ISPs are neutral, we proved that there exists a unique SPNE, and the unique equilibrium outcome of the game is (the subscript B refers to "Benchmark"):

- Stage 1 - Internet access Fees chosen by ISPs: $p^{eq}_{N,B} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N)$ and $p^{eq}_{NoN,B} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN})$.
- Stage 2 - Side Payment chosen by ISP NoN is of no importance.
- Stage 3 - Qualities chosen by the CP: $q^{eq}_{NoN,B} = \tilde{q}_f$ and $q^{eq}_{N,B} = \tilde{q}_f$.
- Stage 4 - Fractions of EUs with ISPs: $n^{eq}_{N,B} = \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{3(t_{NoN}+t_N)}$ and $n^{eq}_{NoN,B} = \frac{2t_N+t_{NoN}}{3(t_{NoN}+t_N)}$.

Note that this case is similar to candidate outcome (e), i.e. the only candidate outcome of our model by which $z^{eq} = 0$. In this case, both ISPs are active and the CP offers the free quality on both ISPs. Note that in this case, the asymmetries of the model only arise from the asymmetry in t_N and t_{NoN}. Thus, EUs are divided between ISPs depending on t_N and t_{NoN}, and the Internet access fees (p_N and p_{NoN}) are a function of transport costs (t_N and t_{NoN}). Also, similar to the candidate outcome (b) of the previous section, if t_N (respectively, t_{NoN}) increases, p_{NoN} (respectively, p_N) increases with a rate $\frac{2}{3}$rd the rate of the growth of this transport cost. Also, counter-intuitively, p_N (respectively, p_{NoN}) increases with a rate $\frac{1}{3}$rd of the rate of growth of t_N (respectively, t_{NoN}).

In this case, Internet access fees are independent of the quality provided for EUs, i.e. $\tilde{q}_f$. Recall that in contrast, in a non-neutral regime, the Internet access fee quoted by ISP NoN is dependent on the quality she provides ($\tilde{q}_p$). The reason lies in the product differentiation in the latter. The non-neutral ISP can charge for the quality she provides for EUs through differentiating her product from the neutral ISP. While in a neutral regime, no ISP can charge for the quality they provide because of competition. It is noteworthy that if $t_{NoN}\&t_N \to 0$, $p^{eq}_{NoN,B}\&p^{eq}_{N,B} \to c$. In other words, in the absence of inertias, since there is no differentiation between the quality offered by the ISPs in the neutral regime, price competition drives the access fees to the marginal cost. This implies that by removing the inertias (t_N and t_{NoN}), the model would be similar to a Bertrand competition Mas-Colell et al. (1995). Thus, considering the inertias brings a realistic dimension to the model.

The relationship between n^{eq}_N and n^{eq}_{NoN} and the transport costs are similar to that of candidate outcomes (b) and (c) of the previous section, and is investigated in Section 6.1.

6. Numerical Results

First, in Section 6.1, using numerical analysis, we find the NE strategies of Stage 1 for various parameters. Recall that strategies of Stage 1 yield one of the outcomes (a)-(e). In Section 6.2, we complement the discussions in Section 5.1, by providing more intuitions about n_{NoN}^{eq}, $\tilde{p}^{eq}$, and the payoff of ISPs, based on the numerical results. We assess the benefits of non-neutrality by comparing the results of the model with the benchmark case in Section 6.3. In Section 6.4, we provide regulatory comments based on the results.

6.1. NE Strategies

Recall that if SPNE exists, it would of the form of outcomes (a)-(e) (Section 5.1). Now, we check whether these outcomes are indeed SPNE. We only need to check whether the candidate strategies of Stage 1 are NE. For doing so, we check for any profitable deviation for each ISPs. To check for unilateral deviations, we consider different regions of Δp (regions characterized in Theorem 2). In each region, we can identify potential profitable deviations (using first order condition for some regions, and the fact that payoff of ISPs are monotonic in other regions). Thus, the search for the best deviations is equivalent to comparing the payoff of finite number of candidate deviations with the payoff of the candidate equilibrium. We also check conditions listed in Theorems 6, 7, and 9.

We now present two illustrative examples. In Figure 2a, we identify the NE strategies of stage 1 for different regions of t_N and t_{NoN} when $\kappa_u = 1$ and $\kappa_{ad} = 0.5$. In Figure 2b, we identify the NE strategies when $\kappa_u = 0.5$ and $\kappa_{ad} = 1$. For the figures, we consider $\tilde{q}_f = 1$, $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$, and $c = 1$. Numerical results for a large set of parameters reveal that the pattern of NE strategies for different values of parameters is similar to one of the two pattern presented in Figures 2a and 2b. Overall, the outcome in which the neutral ISP is driven out of the market occurs when t_N and t_{NoN} are small. As t_N and t_{NoN} increases, we expect to have equilibrium outcomes in which both ISPs are active. Next, we discuss about the trends we observe in the results.

Note that in Theorem 6, we proved that, for $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$ and $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, candidate strategy (Theorem 6-1) is an NE. Numerical results for a large set of parameters also reveal that for $\tilde{q}_p \geq$



(a) $\kappa_u = 1$ and $\kappa_{ad} = 0.5$ (b) $\kappa_u = 0.5$ and $\kappa_{ad} = 1$

Figure 2 NE strategies of Stage 1 for various t_N and t_{NoN}

$\frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$ and $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, candidate strategy (Theorem 7-1) is also an NE strategy. Note that these two strategies are the same and are listed under candidate outcome (a). Therefore, when $\frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}} \leq \tilde{q}_p$, (a) is an SPNE outcome. In this case, since the transport costs are low, EUs can easily switch ISPs. Thus, ISP NoN is able to attract all EUs by discounting the Internet access fee for EUs using some of the side payment received from the CP. Therefore, the neutral ISP would be driven out of the market.

With increase in t_N or t_{NoN}, EUs have more inertia. Thus, one of the ISPs should provide a low Internet access fee for EUs to attract them all. However, in this case, ISPs prefer to maintain a high Internet access fee for EUs (Endnote 5.), and split the EUs. Thus, as t_N and t_{NoN} increases, we expect to have equilibrium outcomes in which both ISPs are active. Numerical results reveal that if $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$ and $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, candidate strategy (Theorem 6-2) is an NE. In addition, consider the lines $t_N + 2t_{NoN} = \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})$ and $t_N + t_{NoN} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. Results reveal that when the point (t_N, t_{NoN}) is just above these lines, the candidate strategy (Theorem 7-2) is an NE strategy. When (t_N, t_{NoN}) is substantially above these lines, then candidate strategy (Theorem 7-3) is an NE strategy. This result have been proved in Theorem 8. In addition, when (t_N, t_{NoN}) is above these lines, but is in an intermediate range, then no NE exists.



Figure 3 n^{eq}_{NoN} with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}

Numerical results for large set of parameters also reveal that the NE is unique, if it were to exist (in Figures there exists only one NE in each region). In addition, extensive numerical results reveal that candidate outcomes (d) and (e) are never SPNE. Thus, henceforth we do not include (d) and (e) in our discussions about the results.

6.2. Dependencies of n^{eq}_{NoN}, $\tilde{p}^{eq}$, and Payoffs of ISPs to t_N and t_{NoN}

Note that in Section 5.1, we explained that the relationship between n^{eq}_{NoN} and the transport costs is not obvious from the expressions. Thus, in this section, we provide intuitions for the behavior of n^{eq}_{NoN}, and subsequently $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ and the payoffs of ISPs with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}.

Numerical Results on n^{eq}_{NoN}: Numerical results reveal that n^{eq}_{NoN} is non-increasing with respect to both transport costs. For instance, in Figure 3, we plot the value of n^{eq}_{NoN} with respect to t_{NoN} and t_N, when $\tilde{q}_f = 1$ and $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$. Recall that $n^{eq}_N = 1 - n^{eq}_{NoN}$. Thus, we only plot n^{eq}_{NoN}.

Note that for candidate outcome (a), as we know from the results, $n^{eq}_{NoN} = 1$. To understand the results for candidate outcomes (b) and (c), note that from (5) the number of EUs with each ISP has a decreasing relation with (i) the transport costs of the ISP, and (ii) the Internet access fee of the ISP which itself is increasing with both transport costs. In addition, the number of EUs with the ISP has an increasing relation with respect to the same parameters for the other ISP. Thus, different factors, some decreasing and some increasing with respect to the transport cost of an ISP, play a role in determining the number of EUs with each ISP. Overall, it turns out that the effect of increasing either of the transport costs decreases the incentive of EUs to join ISP NoN. Thus, in candidate outcomes (b) and (c), n^{eq}_{NoN} is decreasing with respect to both transport costs.



Figure 4 $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}



Figure 5 Payoff of ISPs with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}

Numerical Results on $\tilde{p}^{eq}$: Note that the higher the number of EUs with ISP NoN, the higher would be the benefit of the CP from the premium quality. Thus, we expect the side-payment, i.e. $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ to be increasing with respect to number of EUs with ISP NoN. Results in Section 5.1 also confirms this fact. Thus, the relationship between $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ and the transport costs is similar to the relationship between n^{eq}_{NoN} and the transport costs. Therefore, in candidate outcome (b) and (c), the higher one of the transport costs, the lower would be the side payments. For instance, in Figures 4, we plot the value of $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ with respect to t_{NoN} and t_N, respectively, when $\tilde{q}_f = 1$ and $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$.

Note that as we discussed in Section 5.1, in candidate outcome (b), $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ can be positive or negative. However, numerical results for a large set of parameters reveal that $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ is positive, whenever this candidate outcome is SPNE.

Numerical Results on the Payoffs of ISPs: Numerical results for the case $\tilde{q}_f = 1$ and $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$ are plotted in Figure 5. If there is no NE strategy, we plot the payoff of ISPs in the benchmark case, i.e. when both ISPs are neutral.

Note that when the market of power ISP NoN is small, i.e. the fraction $\frac{t_N}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$ is small, then the payoff of ISP NoN would be lower than the payoff of ISP N (Figure 5-left).

For candidate outcome (a), the payoff of ISP N is zero (since the number of EUs with this ISP is zero), and the payoff of ISP NoN is independent of t_N (since ISP N is out of the market), but decreasing with respect to t_{NoN} (since p^{eq}_{NoN} is decreasing with t_{NoN}). Intuitively, we expect the utility of an ISP to be decreasing with respect to the transport cost of that ISP, and increasing with respect to the transport cost of the other ISP. However, for some parameters and some of the candidate outcomes, results reveal that the payoff of an ISP is increasing with the transport cost of the ISP. Next, we explain the underlying reasons for this counter-intuitive behavior.

Note that the payoff of an ISP is increasing with (i) the number of EUs with the ISP and also (ii) the Internet access fee charged to the EUs. Recall that for the neutral ISP, in candidate outcomes (b), (c), and the benchmark case, both of (i) and (ii) are increasing with respect to both transport costs. Thus, the payoff of ISP N is increasing with respect to both transport costs. On the other hand, for ISP NoN, the number of EUs is decreasing and the Internet access fee is increasing with the transport costs. Thus, depending on which of these factors overweights the other one, the payoff of ISP NoN can be decreasing or increasing with respect to the transport costs.

6.3. Profits of Entities Due to Non-neutrality

We compare the results of the model and the benchmark case in which both ISPs are neutral. We compare Internet access fees, payoff of ISPs, the welfare of EUs, and the payoff of the CP in Sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, and 6.3.4, respectively.

6.3.1. Internet Access Fees In a non-neutral case, the neutral ISP would always decrease her Internet access fee, while that of the non-neutral ISP could be higher or lower depending on the parameters of the market. We now provide insights on when each of these scenarios happens.

First, note that the discount that ISP N provides for EUs in a non-neutral case, i.e. $p^{eq}_{N,B} - p^{eq}_{N}$, is always positive for candidate outcomes (a), (b), and (c) (using previous results). Thus, the neutral

ISP would always decrease her Internet access fee in a non-neutral scenario in order to compete with the non-neutral ISP which is now offering a better quality.

In a non-neutral regime, if (a) occurs, then the discount that ISP NoN provides for EUs in a non-neutral case is $p^{eq}_{NoN,B} - p^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{1}{3}(5t_{NoN} + t_N) - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$ (using the previous results). This discount can be negative or positive, and is decreasing with κ_u and $\tilde{q}_p$, and increasing with t_{NoN} and t_N. Thus, if (i) EUs are not sensitive to the quality, i.e. small κ_u, (ii) ISP NoN does not provide a high premium quality, i.e. small $\tilde{q}_p$, (iii) end-users cannot switch between ISPs easily, i.e. t_N and t_{NoN} large enough, or a combination of these factors, then ISP NoN provides a cheaper Internet access fee for EUs in comparison to the neutral scenario.

For candidate outcome (b) (respectively, (c)), using the results in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, the amount of discount is $p^{eq}_{NoN,B} - p^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{1}{3}\tilde{q}_p(2\kappa_{ad} - \kappa_u)$ (respectively, $p^{eq}_{NoN,B} - p^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_{ad} - \kappa_u)$). Thus, if $2\kappa_{ad} > \kappa_u$, i.e. the sensitivity of the CP is high enough, then the discount is positive and is increasing with the premium quality (respectively, the difference between the premium and free quality). On the other hand, if the sensitivity of the CP is low, then the discount is negative, i.e. ISP NoN charges higher access fees to the EUs. The reason is that if the CP is sensitive to the quality, ISP NoN can charge higher side-payments to the CP. Thus, she can provide some of these new revenue to EUs as a discount even though they receive a premium quality. This is not possible when the CP is not sensitive to the quality of her content. In this case, ISP NoN charges the premium quality to the EUs directly, i.e. higher Internet access fees for EUs.

6.3.2. Payoff of ISPs Consider the payoffs of ISPs N and NoN under both neutral and non-neutral scenarios. The difference in the payoffs for the case $\kappa_u = 0.5$, $\kappa_{ad} = 1$, $\tilde{q}_f = 1$, $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$, and $t_N = 0.3$ are plotted in Figure 6 (using different parameters values yields same intuitions).

Results reveal that the neutral ISP will lose payoff in all of the non-neutral NE strategies, i.e. those that yield $z^{eq} = 1$ (Figure 6-right). Note that in case (a), ISP N would be driven out of the market. Thus, $\pi^{eq}_N = 0$, while $\pi^{eq}_{N,B} > 0$. In cases (b) and (c), although ISP N is active, she has to subsidize the Internet connection fee for EUs to be able to compete with ISP NoN, while possibly can attract lower number of EUs. This yields a loss in the payoff under a non-neutral scenario.



Figure 6 The difference between the payoff of ISPs for two scenarios with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}

Results also reveal that for a wide range of parameters, ISP NoN receives a better payoff under a non-neutral scenario (Figure 6-left). We discussed that ISP NoN extracts the additional profit of the CP (from the premium quality her EUs receive) in a non-neutral scenario. In addition, we also explained that for some parameters ($\kappa_u > 2\kappa_{ad}$), ISP NoN charges higher prices to EUs. Even when ISP NoN subsidizes the Internet access fee for EUs ($2\kappa_{ad} > \kappa_{ad}$), she would compensate through the side payment charged to the CP (high κ_{ad} yields a high side payment). Moreover, ISP NoN can potentially attract more EUs by providing a cheaper fee or a premium quality (or both). Thus, overall we expect the non-neutral ISP to receives a better payoff under a non-neutral regime.

However, we can find scenarios in which ISP NoN loses payoff by switching to non-neutrality. For example, with $\kappa_u = \kappa_{ad} = 0.85$, $\tilde{q}_f = 1$, $\tilde{q}_p = 1.03$, $t_N = 0.05$, and $t_{NoN} = 0.8$, then $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} < \pi^{eq}_{NoN,B}$. In particular, the payoff of ISP NoN decreases in a non-neutral regime if the outcome of the market is (a), and κ_u, κ_{ad}, $\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f$, and $\frac{t_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$ (the market power of ISP NoN) are small.

We now explain the underlying reason for this counter-intuitive result. Note that knowing that the other ISP has switched to non-neutrality, the neutral ISP would decrease her Internet access fee for EUs to compensate for the superior quality that her competitor offers. On the other hand, the non-neutral ISP also has to significantly decrease her Internet access fee for EUs (because of her low market power, competition, and low sensitivity of EUs to the quality), while not generating enough revenue from the side-payments received from the CP (because of low sensitivity of the CP to quality or a premium quality that is not significantly better than a free quality). This makes both ISPs, lose revenue in a non-neutral setting under the specified conditions. Note that the non-neutral ISP still extracts the additional profit she creates for EUs.



Figure 7 Difference in EUW with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}



Figure 8 Difference in EUW with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}

6.3.3. EU's Welfare Recall that from (3), the utility of an EU who connects to the ISP $j \in \{\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{NoN}\}$ located at distance x_j of the ISP, and is receiving the content with quality q_j, is $u_{EU,j} = v^* + \kappa_u q_j - t_j x_j - p_j$. Now, let us define the Welfare of EUs (EUW) for an EU connected to ISP j located at distance x_j from this ISP to be $u_{EU,j}(x_j) - v^* = \kappa_u q_j - p_j - t_j x_j$. Note that we dropped the common valuation v^* since it is equal for all EUs in all scenarios, and is only used to guarantee the full coverage of the market, i.e. to prevent negative utility for EUs. Thus, the total welfare of EUs is:

$$\begin{aligned} EUW &= \int_0^{n_N} \big(\kappa_u q_N - p_N - t_N x\big)dx + \int_{n_N}^1 \big(\kappa_u q_{NoN} - p_{NoN} - t_{NoN}(1-x)\big)dx \\ &= (\kappa_u q_N - p_N)n_N - \frac{t_N}{2}n_N^2 + (\kappa_u q_{NoN} - p_{NoN})n_{NoN} - \frac{t_{NoN}}{2}n_{NoN}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Note that since we dropped v^*, EUW could be negative. In Figures 7 and 8, we plot the difference in the EUW of the non-neutral case with the benchmark case for various parameters of the market, when $\tilde{q}_f = 1$ and $\tilde{q}_p = 1.5$.

Results reveal that in general, EUW would be higher in a non-neutral setting if (i) the market power of ISP NoN is low, (ii) the sensitivity of the CP to the quality is high, or (iii) EUs are not very sensitive to the quality, or a combination of these conditions. However, when both transport

costs are sufficiently small, or the sensitivity of EUs (respectively, the CP) to the quality is high (respectively, low), then the benchmark case yields a better EUW in comparison to the non-neutral case. We next explain the reasons behind these results.

Consider the benchmark case. In this case, the welfare of EUs is dependent on the transport costs and the Internet access fees determined by ISPs N and NoN. Recall that both access fees are increasing with t_N and t_{NoN}. Thus, intuitively, EUW of the benchmark case is decreasing with t_N and t_{NoN} (Endnote 6.).

In case (a), in which only the non-neutral ISP is active, EUW is dependent on the Internet access fee of ISP NoN, i.e. $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Thus, EUW of the non-neutral scenario with outcome (a) is increasing with respect to t_{NoN}. In other words, if t_{NoN} is large, ISP NoN should provide a cheaper Internet access fee (subsidizing the access fee), to attract EUs and keep the neutral ISP out of the market. Thus, EUW would be high. In addition, the EUW is independent of t_N. Thus, as Figures 7 and 8 confirm , the difference between the EUW of the non-neutral scenario in case (a) and the EUW of the benchmark case is increasing with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}.

We observe that when both transport costs are sufficiently small, the benchmark case yields a higher EUW than the non-neutral scenario. Note that if t_{NoN} is small, i.e. EUs can join (switch to) ISP NoN without incurring high transport costs, ISP NoN attracts all EUs even when quoting a high Internet access fee for EUs (since it offers a premium quality). Thus, ISP NoN charges a high Internet access fee, and the EUW would be small. On the other hand, if t_N is also small, the EUW of the benchmark case would be high (as discussed previously). Thus, when both transport costs are sufficiently small, we expect the benchmark case to yield a better EUW in comparison to the non-neutral case. Negative differences in Figures 7 and 8 confirm this intuition. Note that in Figure 8, because of high sensitivity of EUs to the quality, EUW of the neutral scenario is higher than the non-neutral scenario even when t_N or t_{NoN} are not small. Finally, observe that the maximum difference in the EUWs is achieved for the highest t_N and t_{NoN} by which the outcome of the game is (a), i.e. when only the non-neutral is active.

For candidate outcomes (b) and (c), similar to the benchmark case, the Internet access fees are increasing with respect to t_N and t_{NoN}. Thus, EUW is expected to be decreasing with respect to these transport costs. Results in the figures reveal that the difference in EUWs is decreasing with respect to t_{NoN} and t_N. This means that EUW of the non-neutral case decreases more than EUW of the benchmark case. This difference is positive when the sensitivity of the EUs to the quality is low, i.e. small κ_u (Figure 7), and negative when κ_u is large (Figure 8). Recall that the non-neutral ISP provides discount to EUs when the sensitivity of the CP to the quality is high enough. If not, ISP NoN charges higher prices to EUs in comparison to the benchmark case. This is the reason that EUW of the non-neutral case is lower than the benchmark case when EUs are highly sensitive to the quality they receive.

Thus, the transport costs and the sensitivity of EUs and the CP to the quality are the important factors in comparing the EUW of the neutral and non-neutral scenario. As explained, the higher the sensitivity of the CP (respectively, EUs) to the quality, the higher (respectively, lower) would be EUW in the non-neutral case.

6.3.4. Payoff of the CP Using (2) and the candidate outcomes listed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, we can calculate the payoff of the CP in different outcomes. Results yield that the equilibrium payoff of the CP in all the possible outcomes of the non-neutral scenario and also in the benchmark scenario are equal and are $\pi_{CP}^{eq} = \pi_{CP,B}^{eq} = \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$. The reason is that the non-neutral ISP is the leader in the this leader-follower game. Thus, knowing the parameters of the game and the tie-breaking assumption 2 of the CP, it can extract all the profits of the CP and make it indifferent between taking the non-neutral option and not taking it.

6.4. Does the Market Need to be Regulated?

We showed that in the presence of a "big" monopolistic CP and when EUs can switch between ISPs, if a non-neutral regime emerges, then neutral ISPs are likely to lose their market share, and are expected to be forced out of the market. In addition, in any NE outcome, the neutral ISP

would lose payoff. Thus, if the regulator is interested in keeping some of the neutral ISPs in the market (Endnote 7.), she should provide incentives for them. These incentives could be in the form of monetary subsidies or tax deductions.

Although for many parameters, the payoff of the non-neutral ISP would be higher by adopting a non-neutral regime, as explained before, with certain conditions on the parameters, an ISP is likely to receive a lower payoff by switching to non-neutral regime. These conditions are when (i) EUs are not sensitive to the quality, i.e. small κ_u, (ii) the CP is not sensitive to the quality her EUs receive, i.e. small κ_{ad}, (iii) ISP NoN does not offer enough differentiation in the quality, i.e. small $\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f$, (iv) the market power of the non-neutral ISP is low, or a combination of these factors. Thus, with these conditions a non-neutral regime is unlikely to emerge, and there is no need for a government intervention.

7. Discussions on Generalization of the Model

Note that we assumed $q_N \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$ and $q_{NoN} \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p\}$. This assumption can be generalized to selecting quality strategies from continuous sets, i.e. $q_N \in [0, \tilde{q}_f]$ and $q_{NoN} \in [0, \tilde{q}_p]$. In this case, the CP pays a side payment of $\tilde{p}q_{NoN}$ if she chooses $q_{NoN} \in (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p]$. In Appendix F, we prove that our results herein would continue to hold under this generalization.

Recall that in our model, being neutral or non-neutral is fixed and is not a decision variable for ISPs. This means that the non-neutral ISP has already have the infrastructure for offering a premium quality to the CP. For this reason the fixed cost of investment on the infrastructure for offering a non-neutral service is not considered in the utility of ISP NoN (1). Even when considering this fixed cost, analyses yield that the results of the paper would be the same as before. Even if we consider both the investment cost and the decision of ISP NoN on being neutral or non-neutral, then the fixed cost of investment would affect the comparison between the payoff of ISP NoN in neutral and non-neutral scenarios only by a constant. This increases the regions of parameters in which an ISP would lose payoff by switching to a non-neutral regime. The overall intuitions of the paper are expected to be the same as before.

The result that over some parameters, an ISP can lose payoff by switching to a non-neutral regime is dependent on the assumption that the neutral and non-neutral ISPs first decide on the Internet access fees, and then the non-neutral ISP decides on the side-payment in the second stage. If we swap the order of these two stages, then the non-neutral ISP would not lose payoff by switching to non-neutrality since in this case, she would be the sole leader of the game. Thus, ISP NoN, in the worst case, obtains the payoff of the neutral scenario. Recall that the reason for our choice of the orders of the stages of the game is that Internet access fees are expected to be kept constant for a longer time horizons in comparison to the side-payment.

Recall that in the hotelling model, we considered EUs to be distributed uniformly between zero and one. In the case of considering a non-uniform distribution, depending on the skewness of the probability measure, results would be similar to small t_N or t_{NoN}. For example, if the probability measure is skewed toward zero, i.e. EUs are distributed close to the neutral ISP, results would be similar to uniform distribution and t_N small.

References

Altman E, Legout A, Xu Y (2011) Network non-neutrality debate: An economic analysis. *NETWORKING 2011*, 68–81 (Springer).

Bourreau M, Kourandi F, Valletti T (2015) Net neutrality with competing Internet platforms. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* 63(1):30–73.

Cheng HK, Bandyopadhyay S, Guo H (2011) The debate on net neutrality: A policy perspective. *Information systems research* 22(1):60–82.

Choi JP, Jeon DS, Kim BC (2015) Net neutrality, business models, and Internet interconnection. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 7(3):104–141.

Economides N, Tag J (2012) Network neutrality on the Internet: A two-sided market analysis. *Information Economics and Policy* 24(2):91–104.

Hanawal MK, Altman E (2013) Network non-neutrality through preferential signaling. *Modeling & Optimization in Mobile, Ad Hoc & Wireless Networks (WiOpt), 2013 11th International Symposium on*, 232–239 (IEEE).

Hermalin BE, Katz ML (2007) The economics of product-line restrictions with an application to the network neutrality debate. *Information Economics and Policy* 19(2):215–248.

Kesidis G (May 2014) A simple two-sided market model with side-payments and ISP service classes. *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM Workshop on Smart Data Pricing* (Toronto).

Kocak F, Kesidis G, Pham TM, Fdida S (Sept. 2013) The effect of caching on a model of content and access provider revenues in information-centric networks. *Proc. ASE/IEEE EconCom* (Washington, DC), URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.1942`.

Krämer J, Wiewiorra L (2012) Network neutrality and congestion sensitive content providers: Implications for content variety, broadband investment, and regulation. *Information Systems Research* 23(4):1303–1321.

Lotfi MH, Kesidis G, Sarkar S (2014) Network non-neutrality on the Internet: Content provision under a subscription revenue model. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.* 42(3):44–44, ISSN 0163-5999.

Lotfi MH, Sarkar S, Kesidis G (2016) Migration to a non-neutral internet: Economics modeling and analysis of impact. *2016 Annual Conference on Information Science and Systems (CISS)*, 511–516 (IEEE).

Lotfi MH, Sarkar S, Sundaresan K, Khojastepour MA (2015) The economics of quality sponsored data in non-neutral networks. *CoRR* abs/1501.02785, URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/1501.02785`.

Ma RT, Misra V (2013) The public option: a nonregulatory alternative to network neutrality. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)* 21(6):1866–1879.

Maillé P, Schwartz G (2016) Content providers volunteering to pay network providers: Better than neutrality? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.07615* .

Mas-Colell A, Whinston MD, Green JR, et al. (1995) *Microeconomic theory*, volume 1 (Oxford university press New York).

Musacchio J, Schwartz G, Walrand J (2009) A two-sided market analysis of provider investment incentives with an application to the net-neutrality issue. *Review of Network Economics* 8(1).

Njoroge P, Ozdaglar A, Stier-Moses NE, Weintraub GY (2010) Investment in two-sided markets and the net neutrality debate. *Review of Network Economics* 12(4):355–402.

Pil Choi J, Kim BC (2010) Net neutrality and investment incentives. *The RAND Journal of Economics* 41(3):446–471.

Ruiz RR, Lohr S (26 Feb. 2015) F.C.C. approves net neutrality rules, classifying broadband internet service as a utility. *NY Times., Web.* .

Schuett F (2010) Network neutrality: A survey of the economic literature. *Review of Network Economics* 9(2).

Seward ZM (27 Aug. 2014) The inside story of how Netflix came to pay Comcast for internet traffic. *Quartz, Web.* .

Vincent J (27 Oct. 2015) European parliament rejects amendments protecting net neutrality. *The Verge, Web.* .

Wyatt E (14 Jan. 2014) Rebuffing F.C.C. in net neutrality case, court allows streaming deals. *NY Times., Web.* .

Wyatt E, Cohen N (23 Feb. 2014) Comcast and Netflix reach deal on service. *NY Times., Web.* .

Proofs of Statements

Appendix A: Proofs of Section 3.2- Stage 3

First, note that by (2), $(q_N, q_{NoN}) = (0,0)$ yields a payoff of zero, while $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f)$ yields a payoff of $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f > 0$. Thus, we can discard strategy $(q_N, q_{NoN}) = (0,0)$ from the candidate solutions in (6). In addition, we use tie-breaking Assumption 1 to discard $(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^U$, $(\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^L$, $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^U \cup F_0^L$, $(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_0^U$, and $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_1^U \cup F_1^L$. Thus, the candidate solutions in (6) can be divided into the sub-sets characterized in Table 1 as follows:

$$(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I \cup F_0^L \ , \ (\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^I \cup F_0^U \ , \ (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I \ , (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I \cup F_1^L \ , \ (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I \tag{EC.1}$$

Moreover, if $0 < n_{NoN} < 1$, then the expression for the payoff in (2), would be (using (5)):

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{CP}(q_N, q_{NoN}, z) = & \frac{t_{NoN} + \kappa_u(q_N - q_{NoN}) + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}} \kappa_{ad} q_N \\ & + \frac{t_N + \kappa_u(q_{NoN} - q_N) + p_N - p_{NoN}}{t_N + t_{NoN}} \kappa_{ad} q_{NoN} - z\tilde{p} q_{NoN} \end{aligned} \tag{EC.2}$$

The following lemmas are used in proving the main results of this section:

LEMMA EC.1. *Let $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p)$ and $(0, \tilde{q}_p)$ belong to the set F^I, i.e. for them $0 < x_N < 1$. Then $\pi_G(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1) \geq \pi_G(0, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1)$ if and only if $\Delta p \geq \Delta p_t$, where $\Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$.*

Proof: The proof is done by comparing the payoffs (note that in both cases $0 < x_N < 1$). We use (EC.2) to write the expression of $\pi_G(q_N, q_{NoN}, z)$:

$$\pi_G(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1) \geq \pi_G(0, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1) \iff$$

$$\big(t_{NoN} - \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p_{NoN} - p_N\big)\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f + \big(t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p_N - p_{NoN}\big)\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p \geq \big(t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + p_N - p_{NoN}\big)\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p$$

$$\iff t_{NoN} - \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p_{NoN} - p_N \geq 0 \iff \Delta p \geq \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} = \Delta p_t$$

The result follows. □

LEMMA EC.2. *Let $(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^L$, i.e. by which $n_{NoN} = 1$. Then, $\pi_{CP}(0, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1) \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$ if and only if $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,1}$, where $\tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$.*

Proof: We use (2) to write the expression of the payoff of the CP:

$$\pi_{CP}(0, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1) \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \iff \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_p \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \iff \tilde{p} \leq \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p}) = \tilde{p}_{t,1}$$

□

LEMMA EC.3. *Let* $(0,\tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$, *i.e. by which* $0 < n_{NoN} < 1$. *Then,* $\pi_{CP}(0,\tilde{q}_p, z=1) \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$ *if and only if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,2}$, *where* $\tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ *and* $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$.

Proof: We compare the payoff with $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$. We use (2) to write the expression of the payoff of the CP:

$$\pi_{CP}(0,\tilde{q}_p, z=1) \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \iff n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_p \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \iff \tilde{p} \leq \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p}) = \tilde{p}_{t,2}$$

where, by (5), $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$. The result follows. □

LEMMA EC.4. *Let* $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$, *i.e. by which* $0 < n_{NoN} < 1$. *Then,* $\pi_G(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p, z=1) \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$ *if and only if* $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,3}$, *where* $\tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad} n_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ *and* $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$.

Proof: We compare the payoff with $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$. We use (2) to write the expression of the payoff of the CP:

$$\pi_G(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p, z=1) \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \iff (1 - n_{NoN})\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f + n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_p \geq \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$$

$$\iff \tilde{p} \leq \kappa_{ad} n_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p}) = \tilde{p}_{t,3}$$

where, by (5), $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$. The result follows. □

REMARK EC.1. The values of Δp_t, $\tilde{p}_{t,1}$, $\tilde{p}_{t,2}$, and $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ characterized in the above lemmas are used in Definition 3.

We should distinguish between the solutions that maximize (2), i.e. (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) which is not unique, and the strategy that is chosen by the CP in the equilibrium, which is a unique choice among the optimum solutions. Thus, we denote the equilibrium strategy of the CP by (q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}), which subsequently yields the equilibrium fraction of EUs with each ISP, i.e. x_N^{eq}, N_N^{eq}, and N_{NoN}^{eq}.

Now, by comparing the payoffs of the candidate solutions and using tie-breaking assumptions, we prove one of the main results of this section, Theorem 1:

Proof of Theorem 1: Note that an equilibrium strategy, i.e. (q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}), should be a global maxima of (2). Suppose $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0$. First, in Part A, we separate the cases that (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) is in F_0^L, F_0^I, or F_0^U, characterize the candidate optimum strategy, i.e. (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*), chosen by the CP

in each of these subsets (Note that $F_0^L \cup F_0^I \cup F_0^U = F_0$), and identify the necessary condition on Δp for each of these candidate optimums to be in a particular subset. In Part B, we summarize the candidate optimum strategies. Finally, in Part C, by comparing the payoffs of the candidate strategies in different regions of Δp and using the tie-breaking assumptions, we characterize the equilibrium strategies.

Part A: First, consider F_0^I. If $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0^I$, i.e. $z^* = 0$, then (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*), by (EC.1), is (a) $(0, \tilde{q}_f)$, or (b) $(\tilde{q}_f, 0)$, or (c) $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f)$. Note that the necessary and sufficient condition for each of these candidate outcomes to be in F_0^I is $\frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u} < \Delta q^* < \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ (Table 1). First consider case (a). Note that $\Delta q^* = \tilde{q}_f$. Thus, the necessary and sufficient condition for (a) to be in F_0^I becomes $\frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u} < \tilde{q}_f < \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, which yields $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f + t_N$. Similarly, For cases (b), the necessary and sufficient condition is $-\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < -\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f + t_N$, and for (c) is $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$.

Now, consider F_0^L. If $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0^L$, then (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*), by (EC.1), is (d) $(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$. Note that, using the condition in Table 1, the necessary and sufficient condition for $(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$ is $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN}$.

Finally, consider F_0^U. If $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0^U$, then (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*), by (EC.1), is (e) $(\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^U$. Using the condition in Table 1, the necessary and sufficient condition for $(\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^U$ is $\Delta p \geq t_N - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f$.

Part B: Note that, as mentioned before, the strategy that is chosen by the CP in the equilibrium is a unique choice among the possible optimum solutions. Thus, if $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0$, then (q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) is of the form of *one* of the followings (the necessary condition for each to be optimum is also listed):

(a) $(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I$, if this is overall optimum then $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f + t_N$ (the necessary condition).

(b) $(\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^I$, the necessary condition: $-\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < -\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f + t_N$.

(c) $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I$, the necessary condition: $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$.

(d) $(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$, the necessary condition: $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN}$.

(e) $(\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^U$, the necessary condition: $\Delta p \geq -\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f + t_N$.

Part C: Now, we compare the payoffs of the CP at each candidate solutions, and use tie-breaking assumptions whenever needed to get the equilibrium strategies of the CP. The payoff of the CP, for each candidate solution, is as follows (by (2)):

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{CP,(a)} &= n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q_f} \quad \& \ 0 < n_{NoN} < 1 \\
\pi_{CP,(b)} &= n_N\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q_f} \quad \& \ 0 < n_N < 1 \\
\pi_{CP,(c)} &= \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q_f} \\
\pi_{CP,(d)} &= \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q_f} \\
\pi_{CP,(e)} &= \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q_f}
\end{aligned} \tag{EC.3}$$

Next, we characterize the equilibrium strategies in different intervals of Δp. First consider $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$. Note that in this case, Δp satisfies the necessary condition of (c) being a candidate strategy, and also the necessary and sufficient condition of (c) being in F_0^I. In addition, $\pi_{CP,(c)} > \pi_{CP,(a)}$ and $\pi_{CP,(c)} > \pi_{CP,(b)}$. Thus, (a) and (b) cannot be overall optimum solutions. Moreover, $\pi_{CP,(c)} = \pi_{CP,(d)}$ and $\pi_{CP,(c)} = \pi_{CP,(e)}$. Using tie-breaking assumption 3 yields that the CP prefers (c) to (d) and (e). Thus, $(\tilde{q_f}, \tilde{q_f}) \in F_0^I$ is chosen as the equilibrium strategy in this interval, and case 1 of the lemma follows.

Now, consider $\Delta p \geq t_N$. Note that in this case, Δp satisfies the necessary condition of (e) being a candidate strategy, and also the necessary and sufficient condition of (e) to be in F_0^U. In addition, this condition rules out (b) and (c). However, for certain intervals of $\Delta p \geq t_N$, the necessary condition of candidate strategies (a) and (d) can be satisfied. We now compare the payoff of (e) to (a) and (d). First note that $\pi_{CP,(e)} > \pi_{CP,(a)}$. Thus candidate strategy (a) can be discarded. Also, $\pi_{CP,(e)} = \pi_{CP,(d)}$. Since $\Delta p = p_{NoN} - p_N \geq t_N > 0$, and by using tie-breaking assumption 5, candidate strategy (e), i.e. $(\tilde{q_f}, 0) \in F_0^U$ is chosen as the equilibrium strategy in this interval by the CP. Thus, case 2 of the lemma follows.

Finally, consider $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$. Note that in this case, Δp satisfies the necessary condition of (d) to be a candidate strategy, and also the necessary and sufficient condition of (d) to be in F_0^L. In addition, this condition rules out (a) and (c). However, for certain intervals of $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$,

the necessary condition of candidate strategies (b) and (e) can be satisfied. We now compare the payoff of (d) to (b) and (e). First note that $\pi_{CP,(d)} > \pi_{CP,(b)}$. Thus candidate strategy (b) can be discarded. Also, $\pi_{CP,(d)} = \pi_{CP,(e)}$. Since $\Delta p = p_{NoN} - p_N \leq -t_{NoN} < 0$, and by using tie-breaking assumption 5, candidate strategy (d), i.e. $(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$ is chosen as the equilibrium strategy in this interval by the CP. Thus, case 3 of the lemma follows.

Note that by (EC.3), $\pi_{CP,(a)} = \pi_{CP,(b)} = \pi_{CP,(c)} = \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$ and these are all the candidate solutions.Thus, the utility of the CP by each candidate equilibrium strategy would be $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$. The result follows. □

Now, we focus on characterizing the candidate strategies and the necessary condition for each of them when $z^{eq} = 1$.

THEOREM EC.1. *If $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_1$, then (q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) is of the form of one of the followings:*

(a) $(0, \tilde{q}_p)$, the necessary condition: $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + t_N$. In addition, $(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$ if and only if $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + t_N$.

(b) $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p)$, the necessary condition: $\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + t_N$. In addition, $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$ iff $\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + t_N$.

(c) $(0, \tilde{q}_p)$, the necessary condition: $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. In addition, $(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^L$ iff $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$.

Proof: Suppose $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_1$. We separate the cases that (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) is in F_1^L, F_1^I, or F_1^U, characterize the candidate optimum solutions chosen by the CP in each of these subsets, and identify the necessary condition on Δp for each of these candidate optimum strategies to be in a particular subset.

Note that by (EC.1), no optimum strategy is chosen in the set F_1^U. Thus, we characterize the optimum strategies chosen in F_1^I and F_1^L by the CP.

Now, consider F_1^I. By (EC.1), if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_1^I$, then (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) is (a) $(0, \tilde{q}_p)$ or (b) $(\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p)$. The necessary condition for each of them to be optimum is to be in F_1^I. In addition, the necessary and sufficient condition for each of these candidate outcomes to be in F_1^I is $\frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u} < \Delta q^* < \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ (by



Figure EC.1 A schematic view of the ordering of different candidate equilibrium stratwgies characterized in Theorem EC.1 with respect to Δp when $\tilde{q}_f > \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ and $z = 1$.

Table 1). Thus, for case (a), the necessary and sufficient condition is $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + t_N$ (note that $\Delta q^* = \tilde{q}_p$), and for case (b) is $\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + t_N$. These yields candidate strategies (a) and (b) and their conditions of the Theorem.

Consider F_1^L. By (EC.1), if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_1^L$, then (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) is (c) $(0, \tilde{q}_p)$. Note that the necessary and sufficient condition for $(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^L$ is $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ (by the condition in Table 1 and $\Delta q = \tilde{q}_p$). The theorem follows. $\square$

The payoff of the CP in each candidate solution of Theorem EC.1 is as follows (using (2)):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_{CP,(a)} = n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_p \quad \& \ 0 < n_{NoN} < 1 \\
&\pi_{CP,(b)} = (1 - n'_{NoN})\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f + n'_{NoN}\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_p \ \ \& \ 0 < n'_N < 1 \\
&\pi_{CP,(c)} = \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_p
\end{aligned} \tag{EC.4}$$

Thus, the payoffs are a function of $\tilde{p}$ and Δp. Now, to get the second main result of this section, we compare the payoff of the candidate answers with the payoff of the candidate strategies when $z = 0$ considering different values of $\tilde{p}$ and Δp, and pick the maximum as the equilibrium strategy of the CP. Thus Theorem 2 is proved as follows:

Proof of Theorem 2: Now, for different regions of Δp, we compare the payoffs of the candidate equilibrium strategies characterized in Theorem EC.1 to each other and also to the equilibrium strategies in Theorem 1, and use tie-breaking assumptions (whenever needed) to characterize the equilibrium strategies of the CP.

First consider $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. In this case, Δp satisfies the necessary condition of candidate strategy (c) in Theorem EC.1. In addition, note that by (EC.4), $\pi_{CP,(c)} > \pi_{CP,(a)}$ and $\pi_{CP,(c)} > \pi_{CP,(b)}$ (by $\tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f$). Thus, for this region, (c) is chosen if and only if this strategy yields a higher

or equal (by tie-breaking assumption 2) payoff than the payoff when $z^{eq}=0$, that is $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_f$ (by Theorem 1). Thus, using Lemma EC.2, $z^{eq}=1$, and $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})=(0,\tilde{q}_p)\in F_1^L$ if $\tilde{p}\leq\tilde{p}_{t,1}$. Otherwise $z^{eq}=0$, since the payoff of (c) and subsequently (a) and (b) are smaller than the payoff when $z^{eq}=0$. Thus, in this case, the equilibrium strategy can be found using Theorem 1. This is item 1 of the theorem.

For $\Delta p\geq t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, the necessary condition of none of the candidate strategies in Theorem EC.1 can be satisfied. Therefore, $z^{eq}=0$. This is item 4 of the theorem.

Now, for the rest of the proof, we consider $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}<\Delta p<t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$. In this case, the necessary condition of candidate strategy (c) of Theorem EC.1 cannot be satisfied. Therefore, we can eliminate (c). On the other hand, the necessary and sufficient condition of (a) of Theorem EC.1 can be met. Now, consider two different cases, $\tilde{q}_f\leq\frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ and $\tilde{q}_f>\frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$:

- $\tilde{q}_f\leq\frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. This yields that $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}\leq t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$. For this case, consider two sub-cases:

— $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}<\Delta p<t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$. In this case, Δp satisfies the necessary and sufficient condition of (b) in Theorem EC.1. Now, we should compare $\pi_{G,(a)}$ and $\pi_{G,(b)}$. In Lemma EC.1, we compare the payoff of the two solutions. In addition, by tie breaking assumption 4, when the payoffs are equal the CP chooses (b) over (a). Thus, if $\Delta p\geq\Delta p_t$, (b), i.e. $(\tilde{q}_f,\tilde{q}_p)$ would be chosen versus (a). Otherwise (a), i.e. $(0,\tilde{q}_p)$ would be chosen. Now, we compare the payoff of the one chosen with the payoff of the case $z=0$, i.e. $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$:

∗ If $\Delta p\geq\Delta p_t$, then by Lemma EC.4 and tie-breaking assumption 2, $z^{eq}=1$ and $(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})=(\tilde{q}_f,\tilde{q}_p)\in F_1^I$ if $\tilde{p}\leq\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ (by comparing the payoff of strategy (b) by the payoff when $z=0$, i.e. $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$). Otherwise $z^{eq}=0$, and the equilibrium strategy can be found using Theorem 1. This is item 2-a-i of the theorem.

∗ If $\Delta p<\Delta p_t$, then by Lemma EC.3 and tie-breaking assumption 2, $z^{eq}=1$ and$(q_N^{eq},q_{NoN}^{eq})=(0,\tilde{q}_p)\in F_1^I$ if $\tilde{p}\leq\tilde{p}_{t,2}$ (by comparing the payoff of strategy (a) by the payoff when $z=0$, i.e. $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$). Otherwise $z^{eq}=0$, and the equilibrium strategy can be found using Theorem 1. This is item 2-a-ii of the theorem.

— $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \le \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$: In this range, the necessary condition of (b) of Theorem EC.1 cannot be satisfied. Thus, the only candidate solution by which $z = 1$, whose necessary and sufficient conditions can be satisfied, is (a) (as stated before). Therefore, we should compare the payoff of (a) with that of when $z^{eq} = 0$, i.e. $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$. Using Lemma EC.3 and Assumption 2, if $\tilde{p} \le \tilde{p}_{t,2}$ then $z^{eq} = 1$ and $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$. Otherwise $z^{eq} = 0$, and the equilibrium strategy can be found using Theorem 1. This is item 2-b of the theorem.

- $\tilde{q}_f > \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$: In this case, $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} > t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Thus, the necessary condition of (b) cannot be satisfied. Therefore, we can eliminate (c) (eliminated before) and (b). On the other hand, the necessary and sufficient condition of (a) of Theorem EC.1 can be met. Therefore, we should compare the payoff of (a) with that of when $z^{eq} = 0$, i.e. $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$. Using Lemma EC.3 and Assumption 2, if $\tilde{p} \le \tilde{p}_{t,2}$ then $z^{eq} = 1$ and $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$. Otherwise $z^{eq} = 0$, since the payoff of (a) is smaller than the payoff when $z^{eq} = 0$. Thus, in this case, the equilibrium strategy can be found using Theorem 1. This is item 3 of the theorem. The result follows. □

The following lemma simplify item 2-a of Theorem 2, and is useful in the next stages:

LEMMA EC.5. *Consider* $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. *If* $\tilde{q}_p \ge \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, *then* $\Delta p < \Delta p_t$. *If* $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, *then* $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p_t < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$, *where* $\Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$ *characterized in Lemma EC.1.*

Proof: First, consider $\tilde{q}_p \ge \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. Note that:

$$\Delta p_t - (t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)) = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_N - t_{NoN} \ge 0$$

Thus for every Δp such that $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$, $\Delta p_t > \Delta p$. This establish the first part of the lemma.

Now, consider $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. In this case:

$$\Delta p_t - (t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)) = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_N - t_{NoN} < 0$$

and

$$\Delta p_t - (\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}) = \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > 0 \qquad (\text{since } \tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f)$$

Thus, $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p_t < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. The result follows. □

Theorem 2 and Lemma EC.5 yields the following corollary:

COROLLARY EC.1. *Let* $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. *Then the structure of the optimum answers of the CP (results in Theorem 2) for the case that* $\tilde{q}_f \leq \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ *is the same as the results when* $\tilde{q}_f > \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$.

Proof: Note that items 1 and 4 of Theorem 3 are the same for both cases, regardless of $\tilde{q}_f$. In addition by Lemma EC.5, when $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, then $\Delta p < \Delta p_t$. Thus, 2-a-i in Theorem 2 would not happen. Note that 2-a-ii and 2-b yields is similar to 3. Thus, the two structures are similar, and the corollary follows. □

Appendix B: Proofs of Section 3.3

First, we prove Theorem 4. Then using the results of this theorem, we prove Theorem 3.

B.1. Proof of Theorem 4

It is sufficient to prove that if any one of the conditions (1) $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, (2) $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_t$, or (3) $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_t) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ is not true, then $z^{eq} = 0$. Thus, in each of the following cases, we consider one of these conditions to be not true, and prove that $z^{eq} = 0$.

- Case 1-$\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$: By Theorem 2, when $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, $z^{eq} = 0$. This case follows.
- Case 2-$\tilde{p}^{eq} \neq \tilde{p}_t$: if $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, using case 1, $z^{eq} = 0$. Now, consider $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. In this case, either $\tilde{p}^{eq} > \tilde{p}_t$ or $\tilde{p}^{eq} < \tilde{p}_t$. We claim that no $\tilde{p}$ such that $\tilde{p} < \tilde{p}_t$ can be an optimum solution (the claim is proved in the next paragraph). Thus, $\tilde{p}^{eq} > \tilde{p}_t$. Note that $\tilde{p}^{eq} > \tilde{p}_t$ yields $z^{eq} = 0$ (by Theorem 2). Thus, the case follows.

Now, we prove that no $\tilde{p}$ such that $\tilde{p} < \tilde{p}_t$ can be an optimum solution. Note that by Theorem 2, when $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, for $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_t$, the CP chooses $z = 1$. Thus, the payoff of ISP NoN (7) is equal to $(p_{NoN} - c)n_{NoN} + \tilde{p}\tilde{q}_f$, and is a strictly increasing function of $\tilde{p}$ (note that p_{NoN} is fixed and by (5), n_{NoN} is independent of $\tilde{p}$). Thus, every $\tilde{p}$ such that $\tilde{p} < \tilde{p}_t$, yields a strictly smaller payoff for ISP NoN in comparison to the the payoff when $\tilde{p} = \tilde{p}_t$. Thus, no $\tilde{p}$ such that $\tilde{p} < \tilde{p}_t$ can be an optimum solution. The result follows.

- Case 3-$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_t) \leq \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$: In this case, either $\tilde{p}^{eq} \neq \tilde{p}_t$ or $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_t$. Note that by Case 2, $\tilde{p}^{eq} \neq \tilde{p}_t$ yields $z^{eq} = 0$, which yields the result.

Now, consider $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_t$. Note that by Theorem 2, the non-neutral ISP can ensure $z^{eq} = 0$, by choosing $\tilde{p}$ greater than $\max\{\tilde{p}_{t,1}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}, \tilde{p}_{t,3}\}$. Thus, since $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_t$, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_t) = \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$.(Endnote 8.) By tie-breaking assumption 6, $z^{eq} = 0$. The theorem follows.

B.2. Proof of Theorem 3

First, note that by Theorem 4, if $z^{eq} = 1$ then $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_t) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ and $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. To prove the reverse, note that if $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_t) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ and $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, $\tilde{p}$ that yields $z^{eq} = 0$ cannot be an optimum answer. Note that by Theorem 2, when $\tilde{p} = \tilde{p}_t$, the ISP NoN can make sure that $z^{eq} = 1$. Thus, in the equilibrium, $z^{eq} = 1$. The result follows.

Appendix C: Proofs of Section 3.4 - Stage 1

C.1. Proof of Theorem 5

We consider different regions of Δp in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. For each region, we prove that there is no NE.

First, consider $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that in this region, the payoff of non-neutral ISP if $z^{eq} = 0$ is at most $p^{eq}_{NoN} - c$ (by (1)). On the other hand, by Theorem 2, by choosing $\tilde{p}' = \tilde{p}_{t,1}$, ISP NoN can ensure that the CP chooses $z^{eq} = 1$. In this case, the payoff of non-neutral ISP (by (1)) is $p'_{NoN} - c + \tilde{p}_{t,1}\tilde{q}_{NoN} = p^{eq}_{NoN} - c + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > p^{eq}_{NoN} - c$. Thus, $\pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, and by Theorem 3, $z^{eq} = 1$. Thus, in this case, there is no NE by which $z^{eq} = 0$.

Now, Consider p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} to be NE strategies by which $z^{eq} = 0$ and $\Delta p^{eq} > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that $t_N + t_{NoN} \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$ (assumption of the theorem) yields $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq t_N$, and $\Delta p^{eq} > t_N$. Thus, by item 2 of Theorem 1, $n^{eq}_N = 1$. Consider a unilateral deviation by neutral ISP such that $p'_N = p^{eq}_N + \epsilon$ in which $\epsilon > 0$ such that $p^{eq}_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that the values of z^{eq}, q^{eq}_N, and q^{eq}_{NoN} is the same as before, since still $\Delta p' = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p'_N > t_N$. Thus, again $n^{eq}_N = 1$, and by (1), the payoff of neutral ISP is an increasing function of p_N. Thus, p'_N is a profitable unilateral deviation. This contradicts the assumption that p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} is NE. Thus, the result of the theorem follows.

C.2. Proof of Theorem 6

Before proving the theorem, we state two lemmas with their proof which are used in the proof of the theorem:

LEMMA EC.6. *If* $p_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ *and* $p_N = c$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$.

Proof: Note that in this case, $\Delta p = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Thus, $\tilde{p}_t = \tilde{p}_{t,1}$. Therefore, using Theorem 3, it is sufficient to prove that $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, where $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ is the payoff of ISP NoN when $z^{eq} = 0$. Note that $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}) \leq p_{NoN} - c = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$ (since by Theorem 2, $n_{NoN} = 1$, and by (1)). In addition, note that, $\tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f$. Thus, this condition holds, and the result follows. □

LEMMA EC.7. *If* $p_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - 2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$, $p_N = c + \frac{2t_{NoN} + t_N - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3}$, $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$, *and* $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p \geq t_N + t_{NoN}$, *then* $z^{eq} = 1$.

Proof: Note that if $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, by definition of $\tilde{p}_t$ (Definition 4), $\tilde{p}_t = \tilde{p}_{t,2}$. Thus, by Theorem 3, it is enough to prove that $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, where $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ is the payoff of ISP NoN when $z^{eq} = 0$.

First, we prove that $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > p_N - c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) \geq p_N - c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \iff \frac{\left(t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})\right)^2}{9(t_N + t_{NoN})} \geq \frac{t_N - t_{NoN} + 2\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3}$$
$$\iff \left(\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}) - t_N - 2t_{NoN}\right)^2 \geq 0$$

In addition, note that $p_N - c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > 0$, since $p_N \geq c$ (under the condition $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$), $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq t_N > 0$ (by the assumption of the lemma), and $\tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f$. Thus, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > 0$.

Now, consider $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$. Note that by the assumption of the lemma $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p \geq t_N + t_{NoN}$. Thus, $\Delta p > t_N$, and by item 2 of Theorem 1, if $z^{eq} = 0$, $n_{NoN} = 0$. Thus, by (1), $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}) = 0$. Therefore, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, and the result follows. □

Now, we prove Theorem 6:

Proof of Theorem 6: We use the optimum strategies of the CP characterized in Theorem 2 to characterize Nash equilibria. Note that for the case that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p \geq t_N + t_{NoN}$, by Corollary EC.1, the structure of the equilibrium strategies chosen by the CP is similar to the case that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f > t_N + t_{NoN}$. Thus, in this case, items 1, 3, and 4 of Theorem 2 characterizes the NE strategies chosen by the CP. Thus, henceforth we assume $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p \geq t_N + t_{NoN}$, and use these items to prove the theorem.

We denote $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ by region A, $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$ by region B, and $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$ by region C. Using Theorem 2, if $z^{eq} = 1$, then $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. Thus, to characterize NE strategies by which $z^{eq} = 1$, we should characterize any possible NE strategies in regions A and B. In Case A, we prove that the only possible NE in region A is $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$. In addition, we prove that these strategies are NE if $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$. If not, then there is no NE in region A. In Case B, we prove that the only possible NE in region B is $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - 2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c + \frac{2t_{NoN} + t_N - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3}$. In addition, we prove that these strategies can be NE strategies if $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$. If not, then there is no NE in region B.

Case A: We characterize the NE strategies p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} such that $\Delta p^{eq} = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. First, in Case A-1, we prove that if $z^{eq} = 1$ the only possible NE in this region is $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$, and with these strategies, z^{eq} is indeed equal to 1. In Case A-2, we characterize the necessary and sufficient conditions by which there is no unilateral profitable deviation for ISPs. This provides the necessary and sufficient condition for these strategies to be NE.

Case A-1: Note that by Theorem 2, for region A, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^L_1$ if and only if $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$. In addition, by Theorem 4, if $z^{eq} = 1$ then $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$. Thus, in this region, if $z^{eq} = 1$, the payoff of ISP NoN is equal to $p_{NoN} - c + \tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1}$ (by (1)) since $n_{NoN} = 1$. Therefore, the payoff is an increasing function of p_{NoN}. In addition, note that in region A, $n_N = 0$ and regardless of p_N, the neutral ISP receives a payoff of zero (by (1)). Thus, p^{eq}_{NoN}, i.e. the equilibrium Internet access fee, should be such that the neutral ISP cannot get a positive payoff by increasing or decreasing p_N, and changing the region of Δp to B or C. Using this condition, we find the equilibrium strategy.

Note that increasing p_N decreases Δp, and cannot change the region of Δp. We claim that by decreasing p_N to p'_N such that $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, the ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p'_N > c$ (the claim is proved in the next paragraph). Therefore, in the equilibrium, p^{eq}_{NoN} is such that even with $p'_N = c$ (the minimum plausible price), $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Thus,

$p^{eq}_{NoN} \leq c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Given that the payoff of ISP NoN is an increasing function of p_{NoN}, we get $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. In addition, we claim that $p^{eq}_N = c$. If not, then $p^{eq}_N > c$. In this case, $\Delta p = p^{eq}_N - p^{eq}_{NoN} < \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. We argued that the payoff of ISP NoN is an increasing function of p_{NoN}. Thus, by increasing p_{NoN} such that $\Delta p = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, ISP NoN can increase her payoff, which is a contradiction with p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} being NE strategies.

To prove the claim, note that if $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, then either (i) $z^{eq} = 0$ or (ii) $z^{eq} = 1$. Note that $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq t_N$, since $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. Thus, for case (i), (q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) is of the form of part 2 of Theorem 1. Thus, $n_N = 1$. Therefore ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p_N > c$ (by (1)). Now consider case (ii), i.e. $z^{eq} = 1$. Note that when $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, Δp is either in region B or C. By Theorem 2, the only deviation that yields $z^{eq} = 1$ is p'_N such that Δp in region B. Note that in this region, by item 3 of Theorem 2, $n_N > 0$. Thus, ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p_N > c$ (by (1)). This completes the proof of the claim that by decreasing p_N to p'_N such that $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, the ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p'_N > c$.

Therefore, the NE strategies are $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$, and the payoff of the ISP NoN at this price by (1) and $\tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ is equal to (note that $n_{NoN} = 1$), and

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \tag{EC.5}$$

which is strictly positive since $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ and $\tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f$.

Note that Lemma EC.6 yields that with p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} $z^{eq} = 1$.

Case A-2: Now, in order to prove that p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} are indeed NE strategies, we show that there is no unilateral profitable deviation for ISPs. First, in Case (A-2-i) we rule out the possibility of a unilateral profitable deviation for ISP N. Then, in Case (A-2-ii) we rule out a possibility of a downward unilateral profitable deviation, i.e. $p_{NoN} < p^{eq}_{NoN}$, for ISP NoN. Finally, in Case (A-3-iii), we consider a deviation of the form $p_{NoN} > p^{eq}_{NoN}$ for ISP NoN, and prove that the necessary and sufficient condition for this deviation to be not profitable is $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$.

Case A-2-i: The construction of strategies p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} yields that there is no profitable deviation for ISP N. To prove this formally, note that the only deviation for ISP N that might be

profitable is $p_N > c$. With this deviation, Δp would be still in region A, in which $n_N = 0$, and the payoff of ISP N is zero. Thus, such a deviation is not profitable.

Case A-2-ii: Now, consider a deviation by ISP NoN such that $p_{NoN} < p^{eq}_{NoN}$. In this case, Δp is in region A, and the payoff of ISP NoN is equal to $p_{NoN} - c + \tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1}$ (by (1) and $n_{NoN} = 1$). Thus, the payoff of ISP NoN is strictly increasing in region A. Therefore, p^{eq}_{NoN} dominates all prices $p_{NoN} < p^{eq}_{NoN}$. Thus, this kind of deviation is not profitable for ISP NoN.

Case A-2-iii: In this case, we consider a deviation such that $p_{NoN} > p^{eq}_{NoN}$. Thus, $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Therefore, Δp is either in Region B or C. First, in Case A-2-iii-a we rule out the possibility of a profitable unilateral deviation in region C. Then, in Case A-2-iii-b, we rule out the possibility of a profitable unilateral deviation in region B if $z^{eq} = 0$. Finally, in Case A-2-iii-c, we prove that a deviation to region B if $z^{eq} = 1$ is not profitable if and only if $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$.

Case A-2-iii-a: Using item 4 of Theorem 2, if Δp in region C, i.e. $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, then $z^{eq} = 0$. In this case, (q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) is of the form of part 2 of Theorem 1 (note that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p \geq t_N + t_{NoN}$). Thus, $n_{NoN} = 0$. Therefore, the ISP NoN receives a payoff of zero, and a deviation of this kind in not profitable for this ISP (since the equilibrium payoff is positive.).

Case A-2-iii-b: Consider a deviation to Region B by ISP NoN by which $z^{eq} = 0$. then by item 2 of Theorem 1, $n_{NoN} = 0$. Therefore, the ISP NoN receives a payoff of zero, and a deviation of this kind in not profitable for this ISP.

Case A-2-iii-c: Now, consider Consider a deviation to Region B by ISP NoN by which $z^{eq} = 1$. In this case, by item 3 of Theorem 2, $(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, and by Theorem 4 and Lemma EC.3, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ and $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$. Therefore, using (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}'_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) &= (p'_{NoN} - c) n_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN}\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \\ &= (p'_{NoN} - c + \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p) n_{NoN} - \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \end{aligned} \tag{EC.6}$$

in which $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - p'_{NoN} + c}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$. The maximum $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}'_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2})$ can be found by applying the first order condition on the payoff, which gives us:

$$p^*_{NoN} = c + \frac{1}{2}(t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad})) \tag{EC.7}$$

This deviation is a profitable deviation in region B if (i) $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$ and (ii) $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. We also claim (claim is proved in the next two paragraphs) that if any deviation to region B is profitable, then (i) $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$ and (ii) $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. Thus, a deviation to this region is profitable if and only if (i) $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$ and (ii) $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$.

Now, we prove the claim that (i) $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$ and (ii) $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. are necessary condition for a profitable deviation. First, we prove that (ii) is a necessary condition. Suppose (ii) is not true. We claim that no p'_{NoN} such that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p'_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$ can be a profitable deviation. To prove this, note that by concavity of (EC.6), if p^*_{NoN} is not such that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, then all p'_{NoN} such that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p'_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$ yields a strictly lower payoff than the maximum of payoffs at the boundary points. Note that with the upper boundary point, $\Delta p = p'_{NoN} - c = t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. In this case, by item 4 of Theorem 2, $z^{eq} = 0$, and by item 2 of Theorem 1, $n_{NoN} = 0$. Thus, the payoff of ISP NoN is zero (by (1)). On the other hand, in the lower boundary point, i.e. $p'_{NoN} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + c$ is equal to p^{eq}_{NoN}. Thus, the maximum payoff at the boundary points is equal to the equilibrium payoff. Therefore, if p^*_{NoN} is not such that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, then all p'_{NoN} such that $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p'_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, yields a payoff which is strictly less than the equilibrium payoff. The proof of (ii) being a necessary condition is complete.

Now, we prove that (i) is a necessary condition. Suppose (i) is not true and $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) \leq \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$. Then, either (ii) is true or not. If (ii) is not true, in the previous paragraph, we prove that no p'_{NoN} if Region B can be a profitable deviation, which yields the result. Now, consider the case that (ii) holds. In this case, by concavity of the payoff, p^*_{NoN} yields the highest payoff among p_{NoN}'s in Region B. Thus, $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) \leq \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$ yields that a deviation to Region B cannot be profitable. This completes the proof of the claim.

Thus, a deviation to region B is profitable if and only if (i) $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) > \pi^{eq}_{NoN}$ and (ii) $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. First we check (i) and then (ii). Using (EC.6), (EC.7), and the

expressions of n_{NoN}, we find the payoff of ISP NoN after deviation and compare it to the value of (EC.15). We claim that (i) is always true unless $\tilde{q}_p = \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$. Note that:

$$\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^*_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) \geq \pi^{eq}_{NoN} \iff \frac{(t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_{ad}+\kappa_u))^2}{4(t_N+t_{NoN})} \geq \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) - t_{NoN}$$
$$\iff \big((\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})\tilde{q}_p - t_N - 2t_{NoN}\big)^2 \geq 0$$

Thus, (i) is true if and only if $\tilde{q}_p \neq \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$.

Now, we check (ii). Note that $p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$ since:

$$p^*_{NoN} - c < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p \iff \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) > -t_N$$

is always true. Now, we should check the lowerbound, i.e. $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c$:

$$\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c \iff \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) < t_N + 2t_{NoN}$$

which is true if and only if $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$.

Now, using the conditions for (i) and (ii) to be true, we can say that (i) and (ii) are true if and only if $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < p^*_{NoN} - c$. Thus, there is no profitable deviation to region B if and only if $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$.

This completes the proof of item 1 of theorem that $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$ are NE strategies if and only if $\tilde{q}_p \geq \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$.

Case B: Now, we characterize any possible NE strategies in region B, i.e. $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, by which $z^{eq} = 1$. First, in case B-1 we prove that if $z^{eq} = 1$, the only possible NE in this region is $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c + \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$. We also prove that the necessary condition for these strategies to be a NE is $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, and verify that these strategies yield $z^{eq} = 1$. In case B-2, we characterize the necessary and sufficient condition by which these is no unilateral profitable deviation for ISPs.

Case B-1: Note that in this region, by item 3 of Theorem 2, if $z^{eq} = 1$, then $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ and $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-\Delta p}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$ (by (5)). Thus, by (1), the payoff of ISP NoN in this region is $\pi_{NoN,B}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) = (p_{NoN} - c)n_{NoN} + \tilde{p}_{t,2}\tilde{q}_p$, and

the payoff of ISP N is $\pi_{N,B} = (p_N - c)(1 - n_{NoN})$. Note that $\tilde{p}_{t,2}\tilde{q}_p = \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p n_{NoN} - \tilde{q}_f)$. Thus, using the expression of n_{NoN}, the payoffs are:

$$\pi_{NoN,B} = (p_{NoN} - c + \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p)(\frac{t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + p_N - p_{NoN}}{t_N + t_{NoN}}) - \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \tag{EC.8}$$

$$\pi_{N,B} = (p_N - c)(\frac{t_{NoN} - \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}}) \tag{EC.9}$$

Note that any NE inside this region should satisfy the first order optimality condition (note that the payoffs are concave). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\pi_N}{dp_N} = 0 \Rightarrow t_{NoN} - \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + p_{NoN} - 2p_N + c = 0 \\ \frac{d\pi_{NoN,B}}{dp_{NoN}} = 0 \Rightarrow t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) + p_N - 2p_{NoN} + c = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{EC.10}$$

Solving the equation yields:

$$p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - 2\kappa_{ad})}{3} \tag{EC.11}$$

$$p^{eq}_{N} = c + \frac{2t_{NoN} + t_N - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3} \tag{EC.12}$$

The equilibrium payoffs for ISP are:

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{\left(t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})\right)^2}{9(t_N + t_{NoN})} - \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \tag{EC.13}$$

$$\pi^{eq}_{N} = \frac{\left(2t_{NoN} + t_N - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})\right)^2}{9(t_N + t_{NoN})} \tag{EC.14}$$

Now, we check the necessary conditions for these strategies to be NE. First, note that if $\tilde{q}_p > \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, then $p^{eq}_N < c$, and p^{eq}_N cannot be an NE. Thus, the first necessary condition for these strategies to be NE is $\tilde{q}_p \leq \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$. The next necessary condition is that $\Delta p^{eq} = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N$ to be in region B, i.e. $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$. We claim that the upperbound always holds. To prove this consider:

$$\Delta p^{eq} < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p \iff 2t_N + t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}) > 0$$

which is always true. Now, we check the lower bound:

$$\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} \iff \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \frac{1}{3}(t_N - t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}))$$
$$\iff \tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}}$$

Thus, this necessary condition together with the previous necessary condition yields that if p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq}, NE strategies, then $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$.

In addition, note that by Lemma EC.7, p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq} indeed yields $z^{eq} = 1$.

Thus, if $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N+2t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, then the NE strategies *can* be p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq}. To prove that these strategies are NE, we should rule out the possibility of a unilateral profitable deviation by both ISPs which we proceed to do in the next case.

Case B-2: In this case, we consider the possibility of a unilateral deviation by ISPs. First, in Case B-2-i, we rule out the possibility of a profitable deviation by the non-neutral ISP, and then in Case B-2-ii, we provide necessary and sufficient condition for a unilateral deviation to be not profitable for the neural ISP.

Case B-2-i: A deviation by the non-neutral ISP can be to regions A, C, and other prices in region B. In the following cases, we prove that a deviation by ISP NoN to each of these regions si not profitable:

Case B-2-i-A: Consider p_N^{eq} fixed and decreasing p_{NoN} such that Δp in regions A, i.e. $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that in A the payoff of the ISP NoN is an increasing function of p_{NoN} (as discussed in Case A). Thus, all other prices are dominated by $p'_{NoN} = p_N^{eq} + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. The payoff in this case is $\pi'_{NoN} = p_N^{eq} + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} - c + z\tilde{q}_p\tilde{p}_{t,1}$ (by (1)), and $\tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ (by definition 3). We claim that this deviation is not profitable for ISP NoN, since:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) \geq p_N^{eq} - c + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \iff \frac{\left(t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})\right)^2}{9(t_N + t_{NoN})} \geq \frac{t_N - t_{NoN} + 2\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3}$$
$$\iff \left(\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad}) - t_N - 2t_{NoN}\right)^2 \geq 0$$

which is true always. Thus, no deviation is profitable for ISP NoN.

Case B-2-i-B: Now, consider a deviation by ISP NoN inside region B. By optimality of the solution inside B, if $z^{eq} = 1$, since $p_N = p_N^{eq}$ is fixed, all other p_{NoN} such that Δp in region B is

dominated in payoff by $p_{NoN} = p_{NoN}^{eq}$. If p_{NoN} is such that $z^{eq} = 0$, then $n_{NoN} = 0$ (by item 2 of Theorem 1 and $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq t_N$). Thus, the payoff of ISP NoN is zero and this deviation is also not profitable.

Case B-2-i-C: In this case, consider a deviation to region C, i.e. $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. Fixing p_N^{eq} and increasing p_{NoN} such that Δp in regions C yields a payoff of zero to ISP NoN (since by item 4 of Theorem 2, $z^{eq} = 0$ in this region, and by Theorem 1, $n_{NoN}^{eq} = 0$.). Thus, this deviation is also not profitable.

Case B-2-ii: Now, consider a unilateral deviation by the non-neutral ISP. Similar to the case B-2-i, this deviation can be to regions A, C, and other prices in region B:

Case B-2-ii-A: In this case, we consider the possibility of a deviation by ISP N to region A, i.e. $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that in region A, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, where $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ is the payoff of ISP NoN when $z^{eq} = 0$. To prove this note that by $\tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > 0$, we can write:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) = p_{NoN} - c + \tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1} > p_{NoN} - c > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$$

Thus, in region A, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, and by Theorem 3, $z^{eq} = 1$. Thus, using Theorem 2, ib this region $n_{NoN} = 1$. Therefore, $n_N = 0$, and by (1), the payoff of ISP N is zero. Thus, a deviation to this region is not profitable.

Case B-2-ii-B: Now, consider a deviation inside region B by ISP N. If $z^{eq} = 1$, by optimality of the solution inside B (since $p_N = p_N^{eq}$ is fixed) all other p_N such that Δp in region B is dominated in payoff by $p_N = p_N^{eq}$.

Now, consider the case that p_N is such that $z^{eq} = 0$. In this case, $n_{NoN} = 0$ (by item 2 of Theorem 1 and $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq t_N$), and such a deviation might be profitable.

In order to have $z^{eq} = 0$, by Theorem 3, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) \leq \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p})$, where $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p})$ is the payoff when $z^{eq} = 0$. Note that by the assumption of the theorem ($\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p \geq t_N + t_{NoN}$), and in this region $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq t_N$. Thus, by Theorem 1, if $z^{eq} = 0$, then $n_{NoN} = 0$.

Therefore, by (1), $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p})=0$. Using (EC.8), we can find $\pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}_{t,2})$, and compare the payoffs:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}_{t,2})\leq\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}) \iff (p^{eq}_{NoN}-c+\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p)(\frac{t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p+p'_N-p^{eq}_{NoN}}{t_N+t_{NoN}})-\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f\leq 0$$
$$\iff p'_N\leq\frac{\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f(t_N+t_{NoN})}{p^{eq}_{NoN}-c+\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p}+p^{eq}_{NoN}-t_{NoN}-\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p=p^d_t$$

Therefore, a deviation is only profitable if $p'_N\leq p^d_t$. If this condition holds, we need to check whether this deviation is indeed profitable. Note that in region B, if $z^{eq}=0$, (as explained before) by Theorem 1, $n_N=1$. Thus, by (1), the payoff of ISP N is an increasing function of p_N, and is equal to p'_N-c. Thus, $p'_N=p^d_t$ yields the maximum payoff after deviation. Therefore, such a deviation is not profitable if and only if $p^d_t-c\leq\pi_N(p^{eq}_N)$.

Case B-2-ii-C: Now, consider a deviation by ISP N to region C, i.e. $\Delta p\geq\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p+t_N$. Note that in region C, $z^{eq}=0$, and by item 2 of Theorem 1, $n_N=1$. Thus, the payoff of ISP N (1) is an increasing function of p_N. Thus, $p'_N=p^{eq}_{NoN}-\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_N$ (by definition of region C) yields the highest payoff after deviation. Note that by (EC.24), $p^{eq}_{NoN}=c+\frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$. Therefore, $p'_N=c+\frac{t_{NoN}-t_N-2\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$. In addition, note that by the assumption of the theorem, $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p\geq t_N+t_{NoN}$. Thus, $p'_N<c$, and by (1), the payoff of neutral ISP is negative. Thus, this deviation is not profitable.

Therefore, we only need to check the condition in Case B-2-ii-B for ruling out profitable deviations. This is item 2 of the theorem. The theorem follows. □

C.3. Proof of Theorem 7

In this case, note that $\tilde{q}_f<\tilde{q}_p<\frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. Thus, we characterize the optimum strategies for the CP using items 1, 2, and 4 of Theorem 2.

First, note that by Lemma EC.5, since $\tilde{q}_p<\frac{t_N+t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$, $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}<\Delta p_t<t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$, where $\Delta p_t=\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}$ characterized in Lemma EC.1. Thus, using this result, we characterize the regions characterized in items 1, 2, and 4 of Theorem 2. We denote $\Delta p\leq\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}$ by region A, $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}<\Delta p<\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}$ by region B_1, $\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}\leq\Delta p<t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$ by region C, $t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)\leq\Delta p<t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$ by set B_2, and $\Delta p\geq t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$ by D. Using Theorem 2,

if $z^{eq}=1$, then $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$. Thus, we characterize any possible NE strategies by which $z^{eq}=1$, in regions A and B_1, C, and B_2:

Case A: First, we consider $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. In this case, we show that the payoff of ISP NoN is an increasing function of Δp. Then, we characterize the NE as $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$, using the fact that when choosing an NE, no player can increase her payoff by unilaterally changing her strategy.

Note that by Theorem 2, for region A, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^L_1$ if and only if $\tilde{p} \leq \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$. In addition, by Theorem 4, if $z^{eq}=1$ then $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ (Definition 3). Thus, in this region, if $z^{eq}=1$, the payoff of ISP NoN is equal to $p_{NoN} - c + \tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1}$ (by (1)) since $n_{NoN}=1$. Therefore, the payoff is an increasing function of p_{NoN}. In addition, note that in region A, $n_N = 0$ and regardless of p_N, the neutral ISP receives a payoff of zero (by (1)). Thus, p^{eq}_{NoN}, i.e. the equilibrium Internet access fee, should be such that the neutral ISP cannot get a positive payoff by increasing or decreasing p_N, and changing the region of Δp to B_1, B_2, or C. Using this condition, we find the equilibrium strategy.

First consider a unilateral deviation by ISP N. Note that increasing p_N decreases Δp, and cannot change the region of Δp. Thus, a deviation of this kind would not be profitable. We claim that by decreasing p_N to p'_N such that $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, the ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p'_N > c$ (the claim is proved in the next paragraph). Therefore, in the equilibrium, p^{eq}_{NoN} is such that even with $p'_N = c$ (the minimum plausible price), $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Thus, $p^{eq}_{NoN} \leq c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ (Otherwise, there exists a $p'_N > c$ by which $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$). Given that the payoff of ISP NoN is an increasing function of p_{NoN}, we get $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. In addition, we claim that $p^{eq}_N = c$. If not, then $p^{eq}_N > c$. In this case, $\Delta p = p^{eq}_N - p^{eq}_{NoN} < \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. We argued that the payoff of ISP NoN is an increasing function of p_{NoN}. Thus, by increasing p_{NoN} such that $\Delta p = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, ISP NoN can increase her payoff, which is a contradiction with p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} being NE strategies.

To prove the claim, note that if $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, then either (i) $z^{eq}=0$ or (ii) $z^{eq}=1$. For case (i), since $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} > -t_{NoN}$, when $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, then (q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) is of the form of

items 1 or 2 of Theorem 1. Thus, $n_N > 0$. Therefore ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p_N > c$ (by (1)). Now consider case (ii), i.e. $z^{eq} = 1$. In this case, if $z^{eq} = 1$, then by using item 2 of Thoerem 2, $n_N > 0$ (since solutions that yield $z^{eq} = 1$ are in F^I.). Thus, ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p_N > c$ (by (1)). This completes the proof of the claim that by decreasing p_N to p'_N such that $p_{NoN} - p'_N > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$, the ISP N can fetch a positive payoff as long as $p'_N > c$.

Therefore, the NE strategies are $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$, and the payoff of the ISP NoN at this price by (1) and $\tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ is equal to (note that $n_{NoN} = 1$), and

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \tag{EC.15}$$

which is strictly positive since $\tilde{q}_p > \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$ and $\tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f$. Note that Lemma EC.6 yields that with p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN}, $z^{eq} = 1$. The first item of the theorem follows.

Case B_1 and B_2: Now, consider regions B_1 and B_2, i.e. $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$ and $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \leq \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, respectively.

Note that in these regions, by items 2-a-ii and 2-b of Theorem 2, if $z^{eq} = 1$, then $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ and $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - \Delta p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$ (Definition 3). Thus, by (1), the payoff of ISP NoN in this region is $\pi_{NoN,B}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) = (p_{NoN} - c)n_{NoN} + \tilde{p}_{t,2}\tilde{q}_p$, and the payoff of ISP N is $\pi_{N,B} = (p_N - c)(1 - n_{NoN})$. Note that $\tilde{p}_{t,2}\tilde{q}_p = \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p n_{NoN} - \tilde{q}_f)$. Thus, using the expression of n_{NoN}, the payoffs are:

$$\pi_{NoN,B}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,2}) = (p_{NoN} - c + \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p)(\frac{t_N + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p + p_N - p_{NoN}}{t_N + t_{NoN}}) - \kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f \tag{EC.16}$$

$$\pi_{N,B}(p_N) = (p_N - c)(\frac{t_{NoN} - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}}) \tag{EC.17}$$

First, we rule out any NE such that $\Delta p^{eq} = t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Suppose that $\Delta p^{eq} = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N = t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Consider a deviation by ISP N such that $p'_N = p^{eq}_N + \epsilon > c$ for $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\Delta p' = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p'_N$ to be in region C. Note that by item 2-a-i of Theorem 2, in region C, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. Thus, the payoff of this ISP with this deviation is (by (8)):

$$\pi_N(p'_N) = (p^{eq}_N + \epsilon - c)(\frac{t_{NoN} - \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N - \epsilon}{t_N + t_{NoN}})$$

Note that $\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\pi_N(p'_N) > \pi_{N,B}(p_N^{eq})$. Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, this deviation is profitable. Thus, the strategies by which $\Delta p^{eq} = t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$ cannot be NE.

Now, we characterize any NE in $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$ and $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$. Note that any NE inside this region should satisfy the first order optimality condition (note that the payoffs are concave). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\pi_N}{dp_N} = 0 &\Rightarrow t_{NoN} - \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p + p_{NoN} - 2p_N + c = 0 \\ \frac{d\pi_{NoN,B}}{dp_{NoN}} = 0 &\Rightarrow t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) + p_N - 2p_{NoN} + c = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{EC.18}$$

Solving the equation yields:

$$p_{NoN}^{eq} = c + \frac{t_{NoN} + 2t_N + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u - 2\kappa_{ad})}{3} \tag{EC.19}$$

$$p_N^{eq} = c + \frac{2t_{NoN} + t_N - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3} \tag{EC.20}$$

First, note that if $\tilde{q}_p > \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, then $p_N^{eq} < c$, and p_N^{eq} cannot be an NE. Thus, the first necessary condition for these strategies to be NE is $\tilde{q}_p \leq \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$. In addition, by Theorem 3, $\pi_{NoN}^{eq} > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p})$ (for these strategies to yield $z^{eq} = 1$). The second item of the theorem follows.

Case C: Now, consider region C, i.e. $\Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} \leq \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Note that in this regions, by items 2-a-i of Theorem 2, if $z^{eq} = 1$, then $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I$. In addition, by Theorem 4 and Definition 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad}n_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$ and $n_{NoN} = \frac{t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-\Delta p}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$ (Definition 3). Thus, by (1), the payoff of ISP NoN in this region is $\pi_{NoN,C}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,3}) = (p_{NoN} - c)n_{NoN} + \tilde{p}_{t,3}\tilde{q}_p$, and the payoff of ISP N is $\pi_{N,B} = (p_N - c)(1 - n_{NoN})$. Note that $\tilde{p}_{t,3}\tilde{q}_p = \kappa_{ad}n_{NoN}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Thus, using the expression of n_{NoN}, the payoffs are:

$$\pi_{NoN,C}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,3}) = (p_{NoN} - c + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f))(\frac{t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p_N - p_{NoN}}{t_N + t_{NoN}}) \tag{EC.21}$$

$$\pi_{N,C}(p_N) = (p_N - c)(\frac{t_{NoN} - \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}}) \tag{EC.22}$$

First, in Part C-1, we characterize any NE in region $\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Later, in Part C-2, we consider the case that $\Delta p^{eq} = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$.

Part C-1: Note that any NE in region $\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}<\Delta p<t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$ should satisfy the first order optimality condition (note that the payoffs are concave). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\pi_{N,C}}{dp_N}=0\Rightarrow t_{NoN}-\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)+p_{NoN}-2p_N+c=0\\ \frac{d\pi_{NoN,C}}{dp_{NoN}}=0\Rightarrow t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-\kappa_{ad})+p_N-2p_{NoN}+c=0\end{aligned}\tag{EC.23}$$

Solving the equation yields:

$$p^{eq}_{NoN}=c+\frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}\tag{EC.24}$$

$$p^{eq}_{N}=c+\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}\tag{EC.25}$$

First, note that if $\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f>\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$, then $p^{eq}_N<c$, and p^{eq}_N cannot be an NE. Thus, the first necessary condition for these strategies to be NE is $\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f\leq\frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$. In addition, by Theorem 3, $\pi^{eq}_{NoN}>\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ (in order for these strategies to yield $z^{eq}=1$). The third item of the theorem follows.

Part C-2: Now, consider p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} such that $\Delta p^{eq}=p^{eq}_{NoN}-p^{eq}_N=\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}$. These strategies are not NE if ISP NoN can strictly increase her payoff by decreasing her price such that Δp in region B_1. Note that using (EC.21) and the expression for Δp^{eq}, the payoff of ISP NoN in this case is:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}_{t,3})=(p_{NoN}-c+\kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f))(\frac{t_N-\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p+t_{NoN}}{t_N+t_{NoN}})\tag{EC.26}$$

By choosing $p'_{NoN}=p^{eq}_{NoN}-\epsilon$ such that $\epsilon\downarrow 0$, ISP NoN can get a limit payoff of (since $\Delta p=\Delta p^{eq}$ when $\epsilon\to 0$, and it is in region B_1, and using (EC.16)):

$$\pi'_{NoN}=\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\pi^{eq}_{NoN}(p_{NoN}-\epsilon,\tilde{p}_{t,3})=(p^{eq}_{NoN}-c+\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p)(\frac{t_N-\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)+t_{NoN}}{t_N+t_{NoN}})-\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f$$

Thus, p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN} such that $\Delta p^{eq}=p^{eq}_{NoN}-p^{eq}_N=\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}$ are not NE if:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi'_{NoN}>\pi_{NoN}(p^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}_{t,3})&\iff(p^{eq}_{NoN}-c+\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_p)\frac{\kappa_u\tilde{q}_f}{t_N+t_{NoN}}-\frac{\kappa_{ad}\kappa_u\tilde{q}_f\tilde{q}_p}{t_N+t_{NoN}}>0\\ &\iff p^{eq}_{NoN}>c\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the necessary condition for these strategy to be NE is $p^{eq}_{NoN}\leq c$. Note that from (EC.21) and (EC.22), since Δp is fixed, the payoffs of ISP NoN and N are an increasing function of p_{NoN} and p_N, respectively. Thus, $p^{eq}_{NoN}=c$, and $p^{eq}_N=c-\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)+t_{NoN}$. Note that a necessary condition for p^{eq}_N to be an NE is that $p^{eq}_N\geq c$. Thus, one necessary condition is that $2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f\leq\frac{t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. In addition, $\pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}_{t,3})>\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ (using Theorem 3, in order for these strategies to yield $z^{eq}=1$). The forth item of the theorem follows.

C.4. Proof of Theorem 8

We use Theorem 7 to prove the result. First, in Part 1, we prove that when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is large, then strategies 1), 2), and 4) listed in Theorem 7 are not NE. In Part 2, we prove that when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is high, then strategy 3) of Theorem 7 is an NE. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Part 1: We prove that strategies 1), 2), and 4) listed in Theorem 7 are not NE in Parts 1-i, 1-ii, and 1-iii, respectively.

Part 1-i: In this part, we prove that, item 1 of Theorem 7, i.e. $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c$ is not an NE. We do so in Parts 1-i-a and 1-i-b, by introducing a unilateral profitable deviation for ISP NoN for the cases that t_{NoN} is large and t_N is large, respectively. Note that in this case, by item 1 of Theorem 2, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) \in (0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F^L_1$. Thus, $n_{NoN} = 1$, and the payoff of ISP NoN is (by (1), Theorem 4, and Definition 3):

$$\pi_{NoN} = \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \tag{EC.27}$$

Part 1-i-a: If t_{NoN} is large, then (EC.27) would be less than zero. A deviation to price $p'_{NoN} = c$ yields a payoff of at least zero for the ISP NoN (by (1)). Thus, this is a profitable deviation.

Part 1-i-b: Now, consider t_N to be large, and a deviation by ISP NoN such that $p'_{NoN} = \frac{1}{2} t_N$ (Thus, $\Delta p = p'_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N = \frac{1}{2} t_N - c$). Note that in this case, $\Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Thus, by item 2-a-i of Theorem 2, $(q^{eq}_n, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. Thus, by (1), the payoff of ISP NoN after deviation (by the definition of $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$ in Definition 3 and Theorem 4) is at least (Endnote 9.) :

$$\pi'_{NoN} = \frac{1}{2} t_N n_{NoN} + \kappa_{ad} n_{NoN}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \tag{EC.28}$$

, where $n_{NoN} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + c}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$. Thus, for t_N large, $n_{NoN} \to \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, comparing (EC.28) with (EC.27) yields:

$$\pi'_{NoN} = \frac{1}{4} t_N + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > \pi_{NoN} \qquad \text{since } t_N \text{ is large}$$

Thus, this deviation is profitable .

Part 1-ii: In this part, we prove that item 2 of Theorem 7, i.e. $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c + \frac{t_{NoN}+2t_N+\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ and $p^{eq}_N = c + \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N-\tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})}{3}$ is not an NE. We do so by proving that Δp^{eq} does not satisfy $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$ and $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$, in the cases that t_{NoN} or t_N is large.

First, note that:

$$\Delta p^{eq} = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N = \frac{1}{3}(t_N - t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad})) \tag{EC.29}$$

If $\Delta p^{eq} < \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$, then $t_N + 2t_{NoN} < 3\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - \tilde{q}_p(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad})$, which is not correct when t_{NoN} or t_N is large. Thus, (a) $\Delta p^{eq} \geq \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$. In addition, if $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) < \Delta p^{eq}$, then $2t_N + t_{NoN} < \tilde{q}_p(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) - 3\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$, which is not correct when t_{NoN} or t_N is large. Thus, (b) $\Delta p^{eq} \leq t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Therefore, (a) and (b) yields that Δp^{eq} is not in the regions specified. Thus, item 2 cannot be an NE.

Part 1-iii: In this part, we prove that item 4 of Theorem 7, i.e. $p^{eq}_{NoN} = c$ and $p^{eq}_N = c - \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + t_{NoN}$ is not an NE. To do so, we prove that there exists a profitable unilateral deviation for ISP NoN. Note that, in this case, $\Delta p^{eq} = \Delta p_t$. By item 2-a-i of Theorem 2, when $\Delta p_t \leq \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$, then $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. Thus, the expression of the payoff of ISP NoN is (by $\tilde{p}_t = \tilde{p}_{t,3}$, Definition 3, Theorem 4, and (9)):

$$\pi_{NoN,C}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,3}) = (p_{NoN} - c + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f))(\frac{t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) + p_N - p_{NoN}}{t_N + t_{NoN}})$$

Note that:

$$\frac{d\pi_{NoN,C}}{dp_{NoN}} = \frac{t_N + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) + p_N - 2p_{NoN} + c}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d\pi_{NoN,C}}{dp_{NoN}}|_{p^{eq}_N, p^{eq}_{NoN}} = \frac{t_N + t_{NoN} + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) - \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$$

Note that $\frac{d\pi_{NoN,C}}{dp_{NoN}}|_{p^{eq}_N, p^{eq}_{NoN}} > 0$, when either t_N or t_{NoN} are large enough. Thus, in this case, the payoff is increasing with respect to p_{NoN}. Thus, $p'_{NoN} = p^{eq}_{NoN} + \epsilon$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small, is a unilateral profitable deviation.

Part 2: We now prove that when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is large, then strategy 3) of Theorem 7 is an NE. To do so, we check conditions (i), (ii), and (iii) of strategy 3) of Theorem 7, in Parts 2-i, 2-ii,

and 2-iii, respectively. Later, in Part 2-iv, we prove that there is no unilateral profitable deviation for ISPs. This completes the proof.

Part 2-i: In this part, we check the condition, i.e. $\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$. Note that in this case:

$$\Delta p^{eq} = \frac{1}{3}(t_N - t_{NoN} + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad})) \tag{EC.30}$$

Comparing the lower boundary yields that:

$$\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} \Rightarrow 2t_{NoN} + t_N + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) - 3\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > 0$$

which is true when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is large. Now, consider the upper boundary:

$$\Delta p^{eq} < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \Rightarrow 2t_N + t_{NoN} + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_u - \kappa_{ad}) > 0$$

which is true when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is large. Thus, condition (i) of strategy 3) of Theorem 7 is true.

Part 2-ii: Condition (ii) of this strategy is $\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f \leq \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}}$. This condition holds when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is large.

Part 2-iii: Now, we check the third condition, i.e. $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,3}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$. We use (1) to find $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}_{t,3})$. Note that by using item 2-a-i of Theorem 2 (since $z^{eq} = 1$), $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p)$. Thus, by the definition of p^{eq}_{NoN}, Δp^{eq}, $\tilde{p}_{t,3}$, using Definition 3, and Theorem 4:

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{\left(t_{NoN} + 2t_N + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})\right)^2}{9(t_N + t_{NoN})} \tag{EC.31}$$

Now, we obtain $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$. Consider the case that $\tilde{p}$ is such that $z^{eq} = 0$. Note that since $\kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$, then $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N$ or $\Delta p^{eq} \geq t_N$. Using item 2 of Theorem 1, if $\Delta p^{eq} \geq t_N$, then $n_{NoN} = 0$, and by (1), $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p}) = 0$. Thus, $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$, and this part follows. Now, consider the case that $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N$. Using item 1 of Theorem 1, if $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N$, then $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F^I_0$. Since $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) \in F^I_0$, we can use (9). Thus, by using p^{eq}_{NoN}, Δp^{eq}, and , $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN}, \tilde{p})$ is:

$$\pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}) = \frac{1}{9(t_N+t_{NoN})}\big(2t_N+t_{NoN}+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})\big)\big(2t_N+t_{NoN}-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_u-\kappa_{ad})\big) \tag{EC.32}$$

Next, we prove that $t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) > 2t_N+t_{NoN}+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad})$ and $t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) > 2t_N+t_{NoN}-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_u-\kappa_{ad})$. This yields $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p})$. To prove the inequalities, note that:

$$t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) > 2t_N+t_{NoN}+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u-2\kappa_{ad}) \iff 3\kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)>0$$

$$t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad}) > 2t_N+t_{NoN}-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(2\kappa_u-\kappa_{ad}) \iff 3\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)>0$$

Since $\tilde{q}_p > \tilde{q}_f$, both inequalities hold. This completes the proof of this part.

Part 2-iv: In this part, we prove that there is no profitable unilateral deviation by ISPs when one of t_N or t_{NoN} is large. To do so, first, in Part 2-iv-NoN, we rule out the possibility of a profitable deviation by the non-neutral ISP. Then, in Part 2-iv-N, we rule out profitable deviations by the neutral ISP.

Note that, by (EC.31), the equilibrium payoff of ISP NoN, $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \pi_{NoN}(\tilde{p}^{eq}_{NoN},\tilde{p}_{t,3})$ is:

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{\big(t_{NoN}+2t_N+(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})\big)^2}{9(t_N+t_{NoN})}$$

In addition, using $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f,\tilde{q}_p)$, p^{eq}_N, Δp^{eq}, and (8), we can find $\pi^{eq}_N = \pi_N(\tilde{p}^{eq}_N)$,:

$$\pi^{eq}_N = \frac{\big(2t_{NoN}+t_N-(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u+\kappa_{ad})\big)^2}{9(t_N+t_{NoN})} \tag{EC.33}$$

Note that when t_N and t_{NoN} are large, π^{eq}_N and π^{eq}_{NoN} would be large.

Consider different regions in Theorem 2. We denote $\Delta p \le \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ by region A, $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN}$ by region B_1, $\Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)-t_{NoN} \le \Delta p < t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$ by region C, $t_N+\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f) \le \Delta p < t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$ by B_2, and $\Delta p \ge t_N+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$ by D. Recall that $\Delta p^{eq} = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N$ is in region C. Note that the payoffs are concave in C, and we found the strategies by solving the first order condition. Thus, there is no unilateral profitable deviation in C.

Part 2-iv-NoN: Now, we consider unilateral deviations by ISP NoN. We prove that any deviation

to regions A, B_1, B_2, and D is not profitable in Cases 2-iv-NoN-A, 2-iv-NoN-B_1, 2-iv-NoN-B_2, and 2-iv-NoN-D, respectively. This yields that no deviation is profitable for ISP NoN.

Case 2-iv-NoN-A: First, we prove that in Region A, $z^{eq}=1$. Note that in this case, by Definition 4, $\tilde{p}_t=\tilde{p}_{t,1}$. Thus, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p}_t)=p_{NoN}-c+\tilde{q}_p\tilde{p}_{t,1}=p_{NoN}-c+\kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p-\tilde{q}_f)$ (by (1), Definition 3, and since $n_{NoN}=1$ by item 1 of Theorem 2). On the other hand, $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})=(p_{NoN}-c)n_{NoN}$. Thus, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p}_t)>\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN},\tilde{p})$ (since $\tilde{q}_p>\tilde{q}_f$ and $0\leq n_{NoN}\leq 1$). Thus, by Theorem 3, in region A, $z^{eq}=1$.

Now, consider p_N^{eq} fixed and decreasing p_{NoN} such that Δp in region A, i.e. $\Delta p\leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}$. Since in Region A, $z^{eq}=1$, and by Theorem 4, the payoff after deviation is $\pi'_{NoN}=p_{NoN}-c+\tilde{q}_p\tilde{p}_{t,1}$ (by (1), Definition 3, and since $n_{NoN}=1$ by item 1 of Theorem 2). Thus, the payoff of the ISP NoN is an increasing function of p_{NoN}. Therefore, all other prices are dominated by $p'_{NoN}=p_N^{eq}+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}$. The payoff in this case is $\pi'_{NoN}=p_N^{eq}+\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p-t_{NoN}-c+\tilde{q}_p\tilde{p}_{t,1}$ (by (1)). Therefore:

$$\pi'_{NoN}=\frac{1}{3}(t_N-t_{NoN})+\alpha \tag{EC.34}$$

where α is a constant independent of t_N and t_{NoN}. Now, in Cases (i), (ii), and (iii), we prove that $\pi^{eq}_{NoN}>\pi'_{NoN}$ when (i) t_N is sufficiently larger than other parameters, (ii) t_{NoN} is sufficiently larger than other parameters, and (iii) t_N and t_{NoN} are of the same order of magnitude and both are sufficiently larger than other parameters, respectively.

Case (i): If t_N is sufficiently larger than other parameters, then:

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN}\approx\frac{4t_N}{9}>\pi'_{NoN}\approx\frac{1}{3}t_N$$

Thus, this deviation is not profitable.

Case (ii): If t_{NoN} is sufficiently larger than other parameters, then:

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN}\approx\frac{t_{NoN}}{9}>\pi'_{NoN}\approx-\frac{1}{3}t_{NoN}$$

Thus, this deviation is also not profitable.

Case (iii): If t_N and t_{NoN} are of the same order of magnitude ($t_N\approx t_{NoN}$) and both are sufficiently larger than other parameters, then:

$$\pi^{eq}_{NoN}=\frac{t_N}{2}>\frac{t_N}{3}>\pi'_{NoN}$$

Thus, this deviation is not profitable.

Thus, any deviation to region A by ISP NoN is not profitable. This completes the proof of this case.

Case 2-iv-NoN-B_1: Now, consider a deviation by ISP NoN to region B_1, i.e. $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$. Note that with this deviation, $p'_{NoN} = \frac{1}{3}(t_N - t_{NoN}) + \alpha$, where $\alpha_l < \alpha < \alpha_u$, in which α_l and α_u are bounded. In addition, by (5), after the deviation, $n'_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + t_{NoN} - \beta}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$, where $\beta > 0$ is bounded ($\beta_l < \beta < \beta_u$, and β_l and β_u bounded). Therefore, for large t_N and t_{NoN}, $n'_{NoN} \to 1$. Thus, by (9), the payoff of ISP NoN after deviation is:

$$\pi'_{NoN} = \frac{1}{3}(t_N - t_{NoN}) + \gamma$$

where γ is bounded (Note that $\tilde{p}$ is independent of t_N and t_{NoN}). This expression is similar to (EC.34). Thus, we can exactly repeat the arguments in Cases i, ii, and iii to prove that any deviation to region B_1 by ISP NoN is not profitable. This completes the proof of this case.

Case 2-iv-NoN-B_2: Now, consider a deviation by ISP NoN to region B_2, i.e. $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \leq \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$. Note that with this deviation, $\Delta p' = t_N + \alpha$, and $p'_{NoN} = \frac{2t_{NoN} + 4t_N}{3} + \gamma$ where $\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \leq \alpha \leq \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$ and thus γ is bounded. Thus, by (5), after this deviation, $n'_{NoN} = \frac{\beta}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$, where $\beta > 0$ is a constant independent of t_N and t_{NoN}, and the payoff of ISP NoN after deviation is $\pi'_{NoN} = \frac{2t_{NoN} + 4t_N}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}\beta + \eta$ (by (1) and considering that by Theorem 4, if $z^{eq} = 1$, then $\tilde{p} = \tilde{p}_{t,2},$, and independent of t_N and t_{NoN}), where η is a constant independent of t_N and t_{NoN}. Thus, when one of t_N and t_{NoN} is large, $\pi'_{NoN} \to constant$. Therefore, $\pi^{eq}_{NoN} > \pi'_{NoN}$. Thus, any deviation to region B_2 by ISP NoN is not profitable.

Case 2-iv-NoN-D: By item 4 of Theorem 2, in region D, $n_{NoN} = 0$. Thus, a deviation to this region, yields a payoff of zero, by (9) and $z^{eq} = 0$. Thus, a deviation of this kind is not profitable for ISP NoN.

Part 2-iv-N: Now, consider unilateral deviations by the neutral ISP. Similar to Part 2-iv-N, we prove that any deviation to regions A, B_1, B_2, and D is not profitable. We do so in Cases 2-iv-N-A, 2-iv-N-B_1, 2-iv-N-B_2, and 2-iv-N-D, respectively.

Case 2-iv-N-A: Consider a deviation by ISP N to region A. In this case, by item 1 of Theorem 2, $n_N = 0$. Thus, the payoff of ISP N after deviation is zero (by (8)), and this deviation is not profitable.

Case 2-iv-N-B_1: Now, consider a deviation by ISP N to region B_1, i.e. $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} < \Delta p < \Delta p_t = \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) - t_{NoN}$. Note that with this deviation, $\Delta p = -t_{NoN} + \alpha$, and $p'_N = \frac{4t_{NoN}+2t_N}{3} + \gamma$, where $\kappa_u\tilde{q}_p < \alpha < \kappa_u(2\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)$ and thus γ is bounded. Thus, by (5), $n'_N = \frac{\beta}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$, where $\beta > 0$ is bounded. By (1). The payoff of ISP N after deviation is $\pi_N = \frac{4t_{NoN}+2t_N}{3(t_N+t_{NoN})}\beta$ (by (1)). Thus, when one of t_N and t_{NoN} is large, $\pi'_N \to constant$. Thus, $\pi_N^{eq} > \pi'_N$. Therefore, any deviation to region B_1 by ISP N is not profitable.

case 2-iv-N-B_2: Now, consider a deviation by ISP NoN to region B_2, i.e. $t_N + \kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \leq \Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$. Note that with this deviation, $\Delta p' = t_N + \alpha$, where $\kappa_u(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) \leq \alpha < \kappa_u\tilde{q}_p$. Thus, $p'_N = \frac{1}{3}(t_{NoN} - t_N) + \beta$, where β is bounded. In addition, by (5), after the deviation, $n'_N = \frac{t_N+t_{NoN}-\gamma}{t_N+t_{NoN}}$, where $\gamma > 0$ is bounded. Therefore, for large t_N or t_{NoN}, $n'_N \to 1$. Thus, by (8), the payoff of ISP N after deviation is:

$$\pi'_N = \frac{1}{3}(t_{NoN} - t_N) + \eta \tag{EC.35}$$

where η is bounded. Now, in Cases i, ii, and iii, we prove that $\pi_N^{eq} > \pi'_N$ when (i) t_N is sufficiently larger than other parameters, (ii) t_{NoN} is sufficiently larger than other parameters, and (iii) t_N and t_{NoN} are of the same order of magnitude and both are sufficiently larger than other parameters, respectively.

Case i: If t_N is sufficiently larger than other parameters, then:

$$\pi_N^{eq} \approx \frac{t_N}{9} > \pi'_N \approx -\frac{1}{3}t_N$$

Thus, this deviation is not profitable.

Case ii: If t_{NoN} is sufficiently larger than other parameters, then:

$$\pi_N^{eq} \approx \frac{4t_{NoN}}{9} > \pi'_N \approx \frac{1}{3}t_{NoN}$$

Thus, this deviation is also not profitable.

Case iii: If t_N and t_{NoN} are of the same order of magnitude ($t_N \approx t_{NoN}$) and both are sufficiently larger than other parameters, then:

$$\pi_N^{eq} = \frac{t_{NoN}}{2} > \frac{t_{NoN}}{3} > \pi'_N$$

Thus, this deviation is not profitable.

Thus, any deviation to Region B_2 by ISP N is not profitable. This completes the proof of this case.

Case 2-iv-N-D: Now, consider decreasing p_{NoN} such that Δp in region D, i.e. $\Delta p \geq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p + t_N$. Note that by item 4 of Theorem 2, $z^{eq} = 0$, and $n_N = 1$. Thus, the payoff of ISP N is equal to $p_N - c$ (by (1)). Thus, the payoff of the ISP N is an increasing function of p_N. Therefore, all other prices are dominated by $p'_N = p_{NoN}^{eq} - (\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p + t_N)$. Thus, the payoff in this case is $\pi'_N = \frac{1}{3}(t_{NoN} - t_N) + \alpha$, where α is a constant and is independent of t_N and t_{NoN}. This expression is similar to (EC.35). Thus, we can exactly repeat the arguments in Cases 2-iv-N-B_2-a, 2-iv-N-B_2-b, and 2-iv-N-B_2-c to prove that any deviation to region D by ISP NoN is not profitable. This completes the proof of this case. This completes the proof of this case, and the theorem.

C.5. Proof of Theorem 9

We consider different regions of Δp in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. For each region, we characterize all possible NE strategies.

First, consider $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that in this region, the payoff of non-neutral ISP if $z^{eq} = 0$ is at most $p_{NoN}^{eq} - c$ (by (1)). On the other hand, by Theorem 2, by choosing $\tilde{p}' = \tilde{p}_{t,1}$, ISP NoN can ensure that the CP chooses $z^{eq} = 1$. In this case, the payoff of non-neutral ISP (by (1)) is $p'_{NoN} - c + \tilde{p}_{t,1}\tilde{q}_{NoN} = p_{NoN}^{eq} - c + \kappa_{ad}(\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f) > p_{NoN}^{eq} - c$. Thus, $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p}_{t,1}) > \pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p})$. Therefore, in this case, there is no NE by which $z^{eq} = 0$.

Now, consider $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$. Note that $\tilde{q}_p < \frac{t_N + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. Thus, two possibility may arise: (i) $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$, and (ii) $\Delta p \geq t_N$. We consider these two cases in Case 1 and 2, respectively.

Case 1: In this case, $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$. By item 1 of Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I$. Note that in this region, $0 < x_N < 1$, and an NE strategy for ISPs should satisfy the first order optimality conditions. Thus, using (8) and (9):

$$\pi_N(p_N) = (p_N - c)\frac{t_{NoN} + p_{NoN} - p_N}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$$
$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, \tilde{p}) = (p_{NoN} - c)\frac{t_N + p_N - p_{NoN}}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$$

Solving the first order optimality condition yields:

$$\begin{aligned} p_N^{eq} &= c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N) \\ p_{NoN}^{eq} &= c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN}) \end{aligned} \tag{EC.36}$$

which is unique. Note that $p_N^{eq} \geq c$ and $p_{NoN}^{eq} \geq c$. First, note that $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} = p_{NoN}^{eq} - p_N^{eq} = \frac{t_N - t_{NoN}}{3} < t_N$.

The necessary condition for this strategy to be an NE is $\pi_{NoN,z=0}(p_{NoN}^{eq}) \geq \pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, \tilde{p}_t)$ (by Theorem 3). The candidate strategies and this necessary condition is listed in the statement of the theorem.

Case 2: Now, consider $\Delta p \geq t_N$. We consider two cases $\Delta p = t_N$ and $\Delta p > t_N$ in Cases 2-i and 2-ii, respectively.

Case 2-i: Now consider strategies p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = t_N$. In this case, using case 2 of Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^U$. Thus, $n_{NoN} = 0$ and $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, z = 0) = 0$, i.e. the payoff of the non-neutral ISP is zero. Consider $\epsilon > 0$ such that $p'_{NoN} = p_{NoN} - \epsilon > c$. In this case, $p'_{NoN} - p_N < t_N$. Thus, by Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^I$ or $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^L$. Thus, $n_{NoN} > 0$, and $\pi_{NoN}(p'_{NoN}, z = 0) > 0$. Thus, p'_{NoN} is a profitable deviation for the non-neutral ISP. Therefore, as long as such a deviation exist p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = t_N$ cannot be NE.

Case 2-ii: Now, consider $\Delta p > t_N$. Thus, by item 2 of Theorem 1, $n_N^{eq} = 1$. Consider a unilateral deviation by neutral ISP such that $p'_N = p_N^{eq} + \epsilon$ in which $\epsilon > 0$ such that $p_{NoN}^{eq} - p'_N > t_N$. Note that the values of q_N^{eq} and q_{NoN}^{eq} is the same as before, since still $\Delta p' = p_{NoN}^{eq} - p'_N > t_N$. Thus, again $n_N^{eq} = 1$, and by (1), the payoff of neutral ISP is an increasing function of p_N. Thus, p'_N is a profitable unilateral deviation. This contradicts the assumption that p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq} is NE. Thus, the result of the theorem follows.

Appendix D: Proof of Theorem 10

The following lemmas allow us to characterize the NE when $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0$, i.e. $z^{eq} = 0$.

Lemmas EC.8 and EC.9 are useful in proving Theorem 10.

LEMMA EC.8. *No p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = p_{NoN} - p_N \leq -t_{NoN}$ can be equilibrium strategies.*

Proof: First, we rule out the existence of an NE when $\Delta p < -t_{NoN}$, and then when $\Delta p = -t_{NoN}$.

First, consider p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p < -t_{NoN}$. In this case, $p_{NoN} < p_N - t_{NoN}$. Note that the payoff of the non-neutral ISP when $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$ is $p_{NoN} - c$ (by (1) and $n_{NoN} = 1$, using case 3 of Theorem 1), and is strictly increasing with respect to p_{NoN}. Thus, every price $p_{NoN} < p_N - t_{NoN}$ yields a strictly lower payoff for the non-neutral ISP in comparison with the payoff of the this ISP when $p_{NoN} = p_N - t_{NoN}$. Thus, there exist a profitable deviation for the non-neutral ISP for strategies such that $p_{NoN} - p_N < -t_{NoN}$. Therefore, no p_{NoN} and p_N such that $p_{NoN} - p_N < -t_{NoN}$ can be NE strategies.

Now consider strategies p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = -t_{NoN}$. In this case, using case 3 of Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$. Thus, $n_N = 0$ and $\pi_N(p_N) = 0$, i.e. the payoff of the neutral ISP is zero. Consider $\epsilon > 0$ such that $p'_N = p_N - \epsilon > c$. In this case, $p_{NoN} - p'_N > -t_{NoN}$. Thus, by Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^I$ or $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^U$. Thus, $n_N > 0$, and $\pi_N(p'_N) > 0$. Thus, p'_N is a profitable deviation for the neutral ISP. Therefore, as long as such a deviation exist p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = -t_{NoN}$ cannot be NE. Now, we prove that such deviation always exist. This complete the proof. Note that this deviation does not exist if and only if $p_N - \epsilon \leq c$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, this deviation does not exist if only if $p_N \leq c$. Thus, $p_{NoN} \leq c - t_{NoN} < c$, which contradicts the fact that if $z = 0$, $p_{NoN}^{eq} \geq c$ (as mentioned in the beginning of the section). The lemma follows. □

LEMMA EC.9. *No p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p \geq t_N$ can be equilibrium strategies.*

Proof: First, we rule out the existence of an NE when $\Delta p > t_N$, and then when $\Delta p = t_N$. Consider p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p > t_N$. In this case, $p_N < p_{NoN} - t_N$. Note that the payoff of the neutral ISP when $\Delta p \geq t_N$ is $p_N - c$ (by (1) and $n_N = 1$, using case 2 of Theorem 1), and is strictly

increasing with respect to p_N. Thus, every price $p_N < p_{NoN} - t_N$ yields a strictly lower payoff for the neutral ISP in comparison with the payoff of the this ISP when $p_N = p_{NoN} - t_N$. Thus, no p_{NoN} and p_N such that $p_{NoN} - p_N > t_N$ can be Ne strategies.

Now consider strategies p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = t_N$. In this case, using case 2 of Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^U$. Thus, $n_{NoN} = 0$ and $\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}, z = 0) = 0$, i.e. the payoff of the non-neutral ISP is zero. Consider $\epsilon > 0$ such that $p'_{NoN} = p_{NoN} - \epsilon > c$. In this case, $p'_{NoN} - p_N < t_N$. Thus, by Theorem 1, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^I$ or $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^L$. Thus, $n_{NoN} > 0$, and $\pi_{NoN}(p'_{NoN}, z = 0) > 0$. Thus, p'_{NoN} is a profitable deviation for the non-neutral ISP. Therefore, as long as such a deviation exist p_{NoN} and p_N such that $\Delta p = t_N$ cannot be NE. Now, we prove that such deviation always exist. This complete the proof. Note that this deviation does not exist if and only if $p_{NoN} - \epsilon \leq c$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, this deviation does not exist if only if $p_{NoN} \leq c$. Therefore, $p_N \leq c - t_N < c$, which contradicts the fact that $p_N^{eq} \geq c$ (as mentioned after at the beginning of the section.). The lemma follows. □

Now, we proceed to prove Theorem 10:

Proof of Theorem 10: First, in Part 1, we characterize the candidate equilibrium strategies by applying the first order condition on the payoffs. Then, in Part 2, we prove that no unilateral deviation is profitable for ISPs. Thus, the strategies characterized in Part 1 are NE.

Part 1: Note that $z^{eq} = 0$. First note that by Lemmas EC.8 and EC.9, no p_N and p_{NoN} such that $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$ or $\Delta p \geq t_N$ can be Nash equilibrium. Thus, we consider $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$. Note that in this region, $0 < x_N < 1$, and an NE strategy for ISPs should satisfy the first order optimality conditions. Thus, using (8) and (9), and item 1 of Theorem 1:

$$\begin{aligned} p_N^{eq} &= c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N) \\ p_{NoN}^{eq} &= c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN}) \end{aligned} \tag{EC.37}$$

which is unique. Note that $p_N^{eq} \geq c$ and $p_{NoN}^{eq} \geq c$. In order to prove that this is an NE, it is enough to prove that (i) $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} = p_{NoN}^{eq} - p_N^{eq} < t_N$, (ii) a deviation of one of the ISPs by which Δp is shifted to the region $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$ or $\Delta p \geq t_N$ is not profitable for that ISP.

The condition (i) can be proved by (EC.37). From this equation, $\Delta p^{eq} = \frac{t_N - t_{NoN}}{3}$. Thus, $\Delta p^{eq} > -t_{NoN}$ and $\Delta p^{eq} < t_N$. Therefore, (i) is true for this case.

Part 2: Now, we should prove that condition (ii) holds, i.e. no unilateral deviation is profitable. First, in Case 2-a, we rule out the possibility of a unilateral deviation when $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$ for both neutral and non-neutral ISPs. Then, we consider $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$ and $\Delta p \geq t_N$, and in Cases 2-NoN and 2-N, we rule out the possibility of a unilateral deviation in these regions for ISP N and NoN, respectively.

Case 2-a: First, note that by concavity of the payoffs (using (8) and (9)) as long as $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p < t_N$, i.e. $0 < x_N < 1$, a unilateral deviation by one of the ISPs from p_N^{eq} or p_{NoN}^{eq} decreases this ISP's payoff. Thus, we should consider the deviation by ISPs by which $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$ or $\Delta p \geq t_N$.

Case 2-NoN: Now, consider the deviations by the non-neutral ISP. Fix $p_N = p_N^{eq}$, and consider two cases. In Case 2-NoN-i (respectively, Case 2-NoN-ii), we consider deviation by ISP NoN such that $\Delta p \geq t_N$ (respectively, $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$).

Case 2-NoN-i: Suppose the non-neutral ISP increases her price from p_{NoN}^{eq} to make $\Delta p \geq t_N$. In this case, $n_{NoN} = 0$, and the payoff of the ISP is zero (by (1)). Since in the candidate equilibrium strategy this payoff is non-negative, this deviation is not profitable.

Case 2-NoN-ii: Now, consider the case in which the non-neutral ISP decreases her price to make $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$. In this case, $n_{NoN} = 1$ and $\pi_{NoN}(p'_{NoN}, z = 0) = p'_{NoN} - c$ (by (1)). Thus, the payoff is a strictly increasing function of p'_{NoN}, and is maximized at $p'_{NoN} = p_N^{eq} - t_{NoN}$. We show that $\pi_{NoN}(p'_{NoN}, z = 0) < \pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, z = 0)$. Note that $\pi_{NoN}(p'_{NoN}, z = 0) = \frac{1}{3}(t_N - t_{NoN})$. In addition, using (EC.37), (1), $0 \leq x_N \leq 1$, (5), and the fact that with p_N^{eq} and p_{NoN}^{eq}, $q_{NoN}^{eq} - q_N^{eq} = 0$:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, z = 0) = \frac{1}{9}\frac{(2t_N + t_{NoN})^2}{t_{NoN} + t_N}$$

Thus:

$$\pi_{NoN}(p'_{NoN}, z = 0) < \pi_{NoN}(p_{NoN}^{eq}, z = 0) \iff 3(t_N^2 - t_{NoN}^2) < 4t_N^2 + t_{NoN}^2 + 4t_N t_{NoN}$$

$$\iff t_N^2 + 4t_{NoN}^2 + 4t_N t_{NoN} > 0$$

where the last inequality is always true. Thus, this deviation is not profitable for ISP NoN.

These cases prove that no deviation form (EC.37) is profitable for ISP NoN.

Case 2-N: Now, consider a deviation by the neutral ISP from (EC.37). Similar argument can be done for the neutral ISP. Fix, $p_{NoN} = p^{eq}_{NoN}$, and consider two cases. In Case 2-N-i (respectively, Case 2-N-ii), we consider deviation by ISP N such that $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$ (respectively, $\Delta p \geq t_N$).

Case 2-N-i: Suppose the neutral ISP increases her price from p^{eq}_N to get $\Delta p \leq -t_{NoN}$. In this case, $n_N = 0$, and the payoff of this ISP is zero. Since in the candidate equilibrium strategy the payoff is non-negative, this deviation is not profitable.

Case 2-N-ii: Now, consider the case in which the non-neutral ISP decreases her price such that $\Delta p \geq t_N$. In this case, $n_N = 1$ and $\pi_N(p'_N) = p'_N - c$. Thus, the payoff is a strictly increasing function of p'_N, and is maximized at $p'_N = p^{eq}_{NoN} - t_N$. We show that $\pi_N(p'_N) < \pi_N(p^{eq}_N)$. Note that $\pi_N(p'_N) = \frac{1}{3}(t_{NoN} - t_N)$ (by (1)). In addition, using (EC.37), (1), $0 \leq x_N \leq 1$, (5), and the fact that with p^{eq}_N and p^{eq}_{NoN}, $q^{eq}_{NoN} - q^{eq}_N = 0$:

$$\pi_N(p^{eq}_N) = \frac{1}{9}\frac{(2t_{NoN} + t_N)^2}{t_{NoN} + t_N}$$

Thus:

$$\pi_N(p'_N) < \pi_N(p^{eq}_N) \iff 3(t^2_{NoN} - t^2_N) < 4t^2_{NoN} + t^2_N + 4t_N t_{NoN}$$

$$\iff t^2_{NoN} + 4t^2_N + 4t_N t_{NoN} > 0$$

where the last inequality is always true. Thus, this deviation is not profitable for ISP N. Thus, there is no profitable deviation for ISP N. This completes the proof, and the lemma follows. □

Appendix E: The outcome of the market

Now, using the equilibrium strategies characterized in previous theorems, we characterize the equilibrium outcomes of the market for different parameters in the following corollaries:

COROLLARY EC.2. *If $t_N + t_{NoN} \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p$, the equilibrium outcome of the market is:*

- *If $t_N + 2t_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})$, then $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^L_1$, $n^{eq}_N = 0$, and $n^{eq}_{NoN} = 1$.*

- *If* $t_N + 2t_{NoN} > \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})$ *and conditions of item 2 of Theorem 6 is satisfied, then* $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n^{eq}_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, $n^{eq}_N = \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN} - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}$, *and* $n^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{2t_N + t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}$.

Proof: First, consider Strategy 1 of Theorem 6. Item 1 of Theorem 2 yields that $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^L_1$. Thus, $n^{eq}_N = 0$, and $n^{eq}_{NoN} = 1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$.

Now, consider Strategy 2 of Theorem 6. Note that we constructed this strategy such that Δp satisfies item 3 of Theorem 2. Thus, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$. Using the expression for $\Delta p = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N$, and (5), the expressions for n^{eq}_N and n^{eq}_{NoN} follow. □

Corollary EC.3. *If Strategy 1 of Theorem 7 is an NE, it yields* $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^L_1$, $n^{eq}_N = 0$, *and* $n^{eq}_{NoN} = 1$. *If Strategy 2 of Theorem 7 is an NE, it yields* $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n^{eq}_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, $n^{eq}_N = \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN} - \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}$, *and* $n^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{2t_N + t_{NoN} + \tilde{q}_p(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}$. *If Strategy 3 of Theorem 7 is an NE, it yields* $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad} n^{eq}_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, $n^{eq}_N = \frac{t_N + 2t_{NoN} - (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}$, *and* $n^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{2t_N + t_{NoN} + (\tilde{q}_p - \tilde{q}_f)(\kappa_u + \kappa_{ad})}{3(t_N + t_{NoN})}$. *If Strategy 4 of Theorem 7 is an NE, it yields* $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad} n^{eq}_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$, $n^{eq}_N = \frac{\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$, *and* $n^{eq}_{NoN} = \frac{t_N + t_{NoN} - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p}{t_N + t_{NoN}}$.

Proof: First, consider Strategy 1 of Theorem 7. Item 1 of Theorem 2 yields that $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^L_1$. Thus, $n^{eq}_N = 0$, and $n^{eq}_{NoN} = 1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,1} = \kappa_{ad}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$.

Now, consider Strategy 2 of Theorem 7. Note that we constructed this strategy such that Δp satisfies items 2-a-ii or 2-b of Theorem 2. Thus, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,2} = \kappa_{ad}(n^{eq}_{NoN} - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$. Using the expression for $\Delta p = p^{eq}_{NoN} - p^{eq}_N$, and (5), the expressions for n^{eq}_N and n^{eq}_{NoN} follow.

Consider Strategies 3 and 4 of Theorem 7. In this case, Δp satisfies item 2-a-i of Theorem 2 (by construction of these strategies). Thus, $(q^{eq}_N, q^{eq}_{NoN}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F^I_1$. In addition, by Theorem 4, $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_{t,3} = \kappa_{ad} n^{eq}_{NoN}(1 - \frac{\tilde{q}_f}{\tilde{q}_p})$. Using the expression of Δp^{eq} for each of the strategies, n^{eq}_N and n^{eq}_{NoN} follow. □

COROLLARY EC.4. *If the strategy of Theorem 9 is an NE, it yields* $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^L$, $n_N^{eq} = \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{3(t_{NoN}+t_N)}$, *and* $n_{NoN}^{eq} = \frac{2t_N+t_{NoN}}{3(t_N+t_{NoN})}$. *Since* $z^{eq} = 0$, $\tilde{p}^{eq}$ *is of no importance.*

Proof: Note that we constructed this strategy such that Δp satisfies item 1 of Theorem 1. Thus, $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I$. Using the expression for $\Delta p = p_{NoN}^{eq} - p_N^{eq}$, and (5), the expressions for n_N^{eq} and n_{NoN}^{eq} follow. □

COROLLARY EC.5. *If both ISPs are neutral, then in the equilibrium, ISPs chooses* $p_N^{eq} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_{NoN} + t_N)$ *and* $p_{NoN}^{eq} = c + \frac{1}{3}(2t_N + t_{NoN})$ *as the Internet access fees. The CP chooses the vector of qualities* $(q_N^{eq}, q_N^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f)$. *The fraction of EUs with each ISP is* $n_N^{eq} = \frac{2t_{NoN}+t_N}{3(t_{NoN}+t_N)}$ *and* $n_{NoN}^{eq} = \frac{2t_N+t_{NoN}}{3(t_{NoN}+t_N)}$.

Results follow from Theorem 1 (note that $-t_{NoN} < \Delta p^{eq} < t_N$), and (5).

Appendix F: Continuous Strategy Set for the CP

In this section, we consider $q_N \in [0, \tilde{q}_f]$ and $q_{NoN} \in [0, \tilde{q}_p]$. In this case, the CP pays a side payment of $\tilde{p}q_{NoN}$ if she chooses $q_{NoN} \in (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p]$. The rest of the model is the same as before. Note that in this case, the optimum strategies in Stage 4 of the game, in which end-users decide on the ISP, is the same as before. *We prove that the optimum decisions made by the CP is similar to the decisions of the CP when she has a discrete set of strategies (explained in the paper).* This yields that the results of the model would the same as before when the CP chooses her strategy from a continuous set.

Therefore, we focus on characterizing the optimum strategies of the CP when she chooses her strategy from continuous sets, i.e. $q_N \in [0, \tilde{q}_f]$ and $q_{NoN} \in [0, \tilde{q}_p]$. The following lemma is useful in defining the maximization and to characterize the optimum answers.

LEMMA EC.10. $\pi_{CP}(q_N, \tilde{q}_{f,NoN}, z = 0) \geq \pi_{CP}(q_N, \tilde{q}_{f,NoN}, z = 1)$.

REMARK EC.2. Note that although we considered z to be a dummy variable, in this lemma and for the purpose of analysis, we treat it as an independent variable.

Proof: The lemma follows by (2), and comparing the expressions in these two cases:

$$\pi_{CP}(q_N, \tilde{q}_{f,NoN}, z=0) - \pi_{CP}(q_N, \tilde{q}_{f,NoN}, z=1) = \tilde{q}_{f,NoN}\tilde{p} \geq 0$$

Note that we used the fact that from (5), since the qualities are the same in both cases, n_N and n_{NoN} are equal for both cases. $\square$

Lemma EC.10 provides the ground to formally define the maximization for the CP as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z,q_N,q_{NoN}} \pi_{CP}(q_N, q_{NoN}, z) = \max_{z,q_N,q_{NoN}} & \left(n_N\kappa_{ad}q_N + n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad}q_{NoN} - z\tilde{p}q_{NoN}\right) \\ \text{s.t:} & \\ & q_N \leq \tilde{q}_f \\ & \text{if } z=1 \quad \tilde{q}_f < q_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_p \\ & \text{if } z=0 \quad q_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_f \end{aligned} \tag{EC.38}$$

Existence of the maximum: Note that the mixed integer programming (EC.38) can be written as two convex maximizations, one for $z=0$ and one for $z=1$. In addition, note that for the case $z=1$, the feasible set is not closed (since $\tilde{q}_f < q_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_p$). Thus, in this case, we should use the "supremum" instead of "maximum". However, using Lemma EC.10, we prove that the maximum of (EC.38) exists, and therefore the term maximum can be used safely. To prove this, consider the closure of the feasible set when $z=1$ formed by adding $\tilde{q}_f$ to the set, i.e. $\tilde{F}_1$. Since the feasible set associated with $z=0$ (F_0) and the closure of the feasible set associated to $z=1$ ($\tilde{F}_1$) are closed and bounded (compact) and the objective function is continuous for each $z \in \{0,1\}$, using Weierstrass Extreme Value Theorem, we can say that a maximum exists in each of these two sets and for the overall optimization (EC.38). If the maxima in $\tilde{F}_1$ is not $\tilde{q}_f$, then the maxima is in the original feasible set (F_1). Therefore the maximum of (EC.38) exists. If not and $\tilde{q}_f$ is the maxima in the set $\tilde{F}_1$, then by Lemma EC.10, the maximum in the set F_0 dominates the maximum of the set $\tilde{F}_1$. Thus, the maxima of (EC.38) is in F_0. Therefore, the maximum of (EC.38) exists, and we can use the term maximum safely.

Henceforth, the solution $(\tilde{q}_N^*, \tilde{q}_{NoN}^*, z^*)$ of the maximization (EC.38) would be called the optimum strategies of the CP. This solution yields x_N^* and subsequently n_N^* and n_{NoN}^* by (5). In addition, we denote the feasible set of (EC.38) by $\mathcal{F}$.

Finding the optimum strategies of the CP: To characterize the optimum strategies, we use the partition the feasible set in Table 1, and characterize the candidate optimum strategies, i.e. the strategies that yield a higher payoff than the rest of the feasible solutions, in each subset. The overall optimum, which is chosen by the CP, is the one that yields the highest payoff among candidate strategies.

Note that although the maximum of the overall optimization exist, a maximum may not necessarily exist in each of the subsets. We will show in the next set of lemmas that the optimization in each subset of the feasible set can be reduced to a convex maximization over linear constraints. Thus, only the extreme points of the feasible sets may constitute the optimum solution. This means that the CP chooses her strategy among the discrete strategies, $q_N \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$ and $q_{NoN} \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p\}$.

We now characterize optimum strategies of the CP, by considering each of the sub-feasible sets and characterizing the optimum solutions in each of them. In Lemma EC.13, we prove that if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^I$, then $q_N^* \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$, $q_{NoN}^* \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p\}$, and $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \neq (0,0)$. In Lemma EC.15, we prove that if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$, then $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_f$, if $q_{NoN}^* \in F_0^L$, and $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_p$, if $q_{NoN}^* \in F_1^L$. Moreover, $0 \leq q_N^* \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u q_{NoN}^* - t_{NoN} - \Delta p)$, and $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u q_{NoN}^* - t_{NoN}$. In Lemma EC.16, we prove that if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$, then $q_N^* = \tilde{q}_f$ and $0 \leq q_{NoN}^* \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_N + \Delta p)$ and $\Delta p \geq t_N - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f$. In addition, Lemmas EC.11 and EC.12 provide some results that are useful in proving Lemmas EC.13-EC.16.

LEMMA EC.11. *In an optimum solution of* (EC.38), $n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad} - z\tilde{p} \geq 0$.

Proof: Suppose there exists an optimum answer such that $n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad} - z\tilde{p} < 0$. Note that $0 \leq n_N, n_{NoN} \leq 1$ and qualities are non-negative. Thus, in this case, $\pi_{CP} < \kappa_{ad} q_N$. However, choosing $z = 0$ and $q_{NoN} = q_N$, yields a profit equal to $\kappa_{ad} q_N$. This contradicts the solution with $n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad} - z\tilde{p} < 0$ to be optimum. Thus, the Lemma follows. $\square$

LEMMA EC.12. *In an optimum solution, the CP offers the content quality equal to one of the threshold at least on one ISP, i.e.* $q_N^* = \tilde{q}_f$ *OR* ($q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_p$ *XOR* $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_f$)*, where XOR means only one the qualities is chosen.*

Proof: Suppose not. Let the optimum qualities to be $\hat{q}_{NoN} < \tilde{q}_f$ if $z = 0$, or $\tilde{q}_f < \hat{q}_{NoN} < \tilde{q}_p$ if $z = 1$, and $\hat{q}_N < \tilde{q}_f$. The difference between the qualities offered in two platforms is $\Delta q = \hat{q}_{NoN} - \hat{q}_N$. Consider $q'_{NoN} = \hat{q}_{NoN} + \epsilon$ and $q'_N = \hat{q}_N + \epsilon$ in which $\epsilon > 0$ and is such that $q'_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_f$ if $z = 0$, or $\tilde{q}_f \leq q'_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_p$ if $z = 1$, and $q'_N \leq \tilde{q}_f$. Note that z remains fixed and $q'_{NoN} - q'_N = \hat{q}_{NoN} - \hat{q}_N = \Delta q$. Since Δq is the same for two cases, the number of subscriber to each ISP is the same for both cases by (5). Lemma EC.11, (2), and the fact that $n_N, n_{NoN} \geq 0$ yield that $\pi'_{CP} \geq \hat{\pi}_{CP}$, where $\hat{\pi}_{CP}$ (, respectively π'_{CP}) is the payoff of the CP when the vector of qualities is $(\hat{q}_N, \hat{q}_{NoN})$ (, respectively, (q'_N, q'_{NoN})).

We now prove if $(\hat{q}_N, \hat{q}_{NoN})$ is the optimum solution, then the inequality is strict, i.e. $\pi'_{CP} > \hat{\pi}_{CP}$. Suppose not, and $\pi'_{CP} = \hat{\pi}_{CP}$. This only happens if $n_{NoN}\kappa_{ad} - z\tilde{p} = 0$ and $n_N = 0$. Note that in this case, $\pi'_{CP} = \hat{\pi}_{CP} = 0$. However, in the previous paragraph, we argued that with $q_N = \tilde{q}_f$ and $q_{NoN} = \tilde{q}_f$, the CP can get a payoff of $\kappa_{ad}\tilde{q}_f > 0$. This contradicts the assumption that $(\hat{q}_N, \hat{q}_{NoN})$ is the optimum solution. Thus, $\pi'_{CP} > \hat{\pi}_{CP}$.

This inequality contradicts the assumption that $(\hat{q}_N, \hat{q}_{NoN})$ is the optimum solution. Thus, the result follows. □

Clearly, the decision of the CP about the vector of qualities depends on the parameter x_N (4), and subsequently on n_N. First, we characterize the candidate strategies of the CP when $0 \leq x_N \leq 1$, i.e. $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^I$ and therefore $n_N = x_N$. Then, we consider the case of $x_N < 0$ ($n_N = 0$ and $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$) and $x_N > 1$ ($n_N = 1$ and $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$). Finally, we combine both cases to determine the optimum strategies of the CP. In the following lemma, we characterize the candidate optimum qualities in F^I, i.e. the strategies by which $0 \leq x_N \leq 1$.

LEMMA EC.13. *If* $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^I$*, i.e. optimum strategies are such that* $0 < x_N^* < 1$*, then* $q_N^* \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$, $q_{NoN}^* \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p\}$, $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \neq (0, 0)$.

REMARK EC.3. Note that to be in F^I and from (5), (q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) should be such that $\frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u} < \Delta q^* = q_{NoN}^* - q_N^* < \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$. In Lemma EC.12, we have proved that the quality on at least one of the ISPs is equal to a threshold. In this lemma, we prove that the qualities offered on both ISPs are equal to thresholds or one of them is zero.

Proof: We would like to characterize the optimum qualities in $F^I = F_0^I \bigcup F_1^I$, i.e. optimum strategies for which $0 < x_N < 1$. First note that by Lemma EC.12, either (a) $q_N^* = c$ and $q_{NoN}^* = c + \Delta q$ where $c = \tilde{q}_f$, or (b) $q_{NoN}^* = c$ and $q_N^* = c - \Delta q$ where $c \in \{\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p\}$. Note that the feasible sets for each case can be rewritten as a function of Δq. We characterize the candidate solutions for each case:

- Case (a): The feasible set for the case (a) is $\Delta q \in G_0 = [-c, \tilde{q}_f - c]$ (for $z = 0$) and $\Delta q \in G_1 = (\tilde{q}_f - c, \tilde{q}_p - c]$ (for $z = 1$), where $c = \tilde{q}_f$. Let $G = G_0 \cup G_1$. Note that if $0 \le x_N \le 1$, then $n_N = x_N$ and $n_{NoN} = 1 - x_N$. Thus, (EC.38) can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{z, \Delta q \in G = G_0 \cup G_1} \pi_{CP}(c, c + \Delta q, z) = \\ &\max_{z, \Delta q \in G} \big(t_{NoN} - \kappa_u \Delta q + p_{NoN} - p_N\big)\kappa_{ad} c + \\ &+ \big(t_N + \kappa_u \Delta q + p_N - p_{NoN}\big)\kappa_{ad}(c + \Delta q) - z\tilde{p}(c + \Delta q) \end{aligned} \tag{EC.39}$$

Note that although the feasible set G_1 is not closed, we used maximum instead of supremum. We will show that the maximum of (EC.39) exists. Thus, the term maximum can be used safely. Note that the objective functions of (EC.39) is a strictly convex functions of Δq. Note that henceforth wherever we refer to maximum without further clarification, we refer to the solution of (EC.38).

Let $\tilde{G}_1$ be the closure of G_1, then $\tilde{G}_1 \backslash G_1 = \{\tilde{q}_f - c\}$. First, we prove that the maximum of (EC.39) exists. Note that G_0 and $\tilde{G}_1$ are closed and bounded (compact) and the objective function of (EC.39) is continuous with respect to Δq for each $z \in \{0, 1\}$. Using Weierstrass Extreme Value Theorem, we can say that a maxima for $\pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 0)$ and $\pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 1)$ exists in each of two sets G_0 and $\tilde{G}_1$, respectively. Thus, the overall maximum for the objective function of (EC.39) over G_0 and $\tilde{G}_1$ exists. Now, consider two cases:

1. If the maxima of $\pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 1)$ in $\tilde{G}_1$ is not $\Delta q = \tilde{q}_f - c$, then the maxima is in the original feasible set (G_1). Therefore the maximum of (EC.39) exists (since G_0 is closed).

2. If $\Delta q = \tilde{q}_f - c$ is the maxima of $\pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 1)$ in the set $\tilde{G}_1$, then by Lemma EC.10, the maximum of $\pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 0)$ in the set G_0 greater than or equal to the maximum of $\pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 1)$ in $\tilde{G}_1$. Thus, the maxima of (EC.39) over G_0 and G_1 exists and is in G_0.

Now, that we have proved the existence of the maximum for (EC.39), we aim to find all the candidate optimum solutions. Note that the set G_0 is closed. Thus, by the strict convexity of the objective function of (EC.39), the candidate optimums in G_0 are the extreme points of G_0. Using the definition of this feasible set, the candidate answers are (i) $q_N^* = \tilde{q}_f$ and $q_{NoN}^* \in \{0, \tilde{q}_f\}$.

Now, consider the feasible set $\tilde{G}_1$, and consider two cases:

1. If $\Delta q = \tilde{q}_f - c$ is not the unique maxima of (EC.39) in $\tilde{G}_1$, then the maxima is in G_1 or G_0. The candidate answers in the set G_0 are already characterized. In addition, by strict convexity of the objective function, the maxima can only be an extreme point of $\tilde{G}_1$. Since $\tilde{q}_f - c$ is not the unique maxima of (EC.38) in $\tilde{G}_1$, $\tilde{q}_p$ is a maxima of (EC.38) in G_1. Thus, by strong convexity, for all $\Delta q \in G_1$ $\pi_{CP}(c, \tilde{q}_p, z = 1) > \pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 1)$, and the only candidate optimum solution over G_1 is at $\Delta q = \tilde{q}_p - c \in G_1$ which yields (ii) $q_N^* = \tilde{q}_f$ and $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_p$.

2. If $\tilde{q}_f - c$ is the unique maxima in $\tilde{G}_1$, then $\pi_{CP}(c, \tilde{q}_f, z = 1) > \pi_{CP}(c, \Delta q + c, z = 1)$ for $\Delta q \in G_1$. By Lemma EC.10, $\pi_{CP}(c, \tilde{q}_f, z = 0) \geq \pi_{CP}(c, \tilde{q}_f, z = 1)$. Therefore, the overall maximum of (EC.39) is in the set G_0, and is as characterized previously.

- Case (b): The feasible set for the case (b) is $\Delta q \in \hat{G}_0 = [c - \tilde{q}_f, c]$ where $c = \tilde{q}_f$ (for $z = 0$), and $\Delta q \in \hat{G}_1 = [c - \tilde{q}_f, c]$ where $c = \tilde{q}_p$ (for $z = 1$). For this case, (EC.38) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{z, \Delta q \in \hat{G} = \hat{G}_0 \cup \hat{G}_1} \pi_{CP}(c - \Delta q, c, z) = \\ &\max_{z, \Delta q \in \hat{G}} \kappa_{ad}\big(t_{NoN} - \kappa_u \Delta q + p_{NoN} - p_N\big)(c - \Delta q) + \\ &\qquad + \kappa_{ad} c\big(t_N + \kappa_u \Delta q + p_N - p_{NoN}\big) - z\tilde{p}c \end{aligned} \tag{EC.40}$$

Note that the feasible set is closed. Thus the term maximum is fine. In addition, the objective functions of (EC.40) are strictly convex functions of Δq. Thus, using the strict convexity and the

definition of the feasible set, i.e. $c-\tilde{q}_f \leq \Delta q^* \leq c$ where c is $\tilde{q}_f$ and $\tilde{q}_p$, respectively, we can get the other set of candidate answers, (iii) $q^*_{NoN}=\tilde{q}_f$ and $\tilde{q}^*_N \in \{0,\tilde{q}_f\}$, and (iv) $\tilde{q}^*_{NoN}=\tilde{q}_p$ and $\tilde{q}^*_N \in \{0,\tilde{q}_f\}$.

From, (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), the result follows. □

The following corollary follows immediately from Lemma EC.13:

COROLLARY EC.6. *The possible candidate optimum strategies by which* $0 < x^*_N < 1$, *i.e.* $(q^*_N, q^*_{NoN}) \in F^I$, *are* (1) $(0,\tilde{q}_f)$, (2) $(\tilde{q}_f,0)$, *and* (3) $(\tilde{q}_f,\tilde{q}_f)$ *when* $z=0$, *i.e.* $(q^*_N, q^*_{NoN}) \in F^I_0$, *and* (1) $(0,\tilde{q}_p)$ *and* (2) $(\tilde{q}_f,\tilde{q}_p)$ *when* $z=1$, *i.e.* $(q^*_N, q^*_{NoN}) \in F^I_1$. *Note that the necessary and sufficient condition for each of these candidate outcomes to be in* F^I *is* $\frac{\Delta p - t_N}{\kappa_u} < \Delta q^* < \frac{\Delta p + t_{NoN}}{\kappa_u}$.

Note that Corollary EC.6 lists all the candidate answers by which $0 < x_N < 1$. In the next three lemmas, we focus on the candidate answers when $x_N \geq 1$ or $x_N \leq 0$.

LEMMA EC.14. *If* $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN}$ *then* $x_N > 0$ *for all choices of* q_{NoN} *and* q_N *in the feasible set* F_0 *(that is* F^L_0 *is an empty set). Similarly, If* $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$ *then* $x_N > 0$ *for all choices of* q_{NoN} *and* q_N *in the feasible set* F_1 *(that is* F^L_1 *is an empty set). In addition, if* $\Delta p < t_N - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f$ *then* $x_N < 1$ *for all choices of* q_{NoN} *and* q_N *in the overall feasible set* $\mathcal{F}$ *(that is* F^U *is an empty set).*

Proof: First note that from (5), $x_N > 0$ is equivalent to:

$$\Delta p > \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) - t_{NoN} \tag{EC.41}$$

Consider $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN}$ (respectively, $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$), if $(q_N, q_{NoN}) \in F_0$ (respectively, $(q_N, q_{NoN}) \in F_1$) then $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN} \geq \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) - t_{NoN}$ (respectively, $\Delta p > \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} \geq \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) - t_{NoN}$) for every choice of $(q_N, q_{NoN}) \in F_0$ (respectively, $(q_N, q_{NoN}) \in F_1$). The inequality $\Delta p > \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) - t_{NoN}$ yields $x_N > 0$. The first result of the lemma follows.

Now, we prove the second statement. From (5), $x_N < 1$ is equivalent to:

$$\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) \tag{EC.42}$$

Consider $\Delta p < t_N - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f$. Note that:

$$\Delta p < t_N - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f \leq t_N + \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N)$$

for every choice of $0 \leq q_N \leq \tilde{q}_f$ and $0 \leq q_{NoN} \leq \tilde{q}_p$ which are all the possible choices in $\mathcal{F}$. The inequality $\Delta p < t_N + \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N)$ yields that $x_N < 1$. The result follows. $\square$

The following lemma characterizes all the candidate answers when $x_N^* \leq 0$, and characterize the necessary condition on parameters for this solutions to be feasible.

LEMMA EC.15. *Let $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$. If $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0^L$ (respectively, if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_1^L$), then $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_f$ (respectively, $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_p$). Moreover, for every $x \in [0, \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN} - \Delta p)]$ (respectively, $x \in [0, \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN} - \Delta p)]$) and $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN}$ (respectively, $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$), $(x, \tilde{q}_f)$ (respectively, $(x, \tilde{q}_p)$) constitutes an optimum solution in F_0^L (respectively, in F_1^L).*

Proof: From (5), $x_N \leq 0$ is equivalent to:

$$\Delta p \leq \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) - t_{NoN} \tag{EC.43}$$

Note that from (5), if $x_N \leq 0$ then $n_N = 0$ and $n_{NoN} = 1$. In this case, the payoff of the CP is,

$$\pi_G = \kappa_{ad} q_{NoN} - z \tilde{p} q_{NoN} \tag{EC.44}$$

Note that the value of the payoff is independent of q_N as long as $n_N = 0$, and from (5) n_N is a function of q_N and q_{NoN}. In addition, note that if there exist a q_{NoN} that satisfies the constraint $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) - t_{NoN}$ (and therefore $n_N = 0$) then $q'_{NoN} \geq q_{NoN}$ also satisfies this constraint. Therefore for $q'_{NoN} \geq q_{NoN}$, $n_N = 0$ and (EC.44) is true. Note that from Lemma EC.11, (EC.44) is an increasing function of q_{NoN}. Thus, if $x_N \leq 0$, then $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_f$ if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0^L$ or $q_{NoN}^* = \tilde{q}_p$ if $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_1^L$ (using the feasible sets in Table 1 and their definitions).

Using (EC.43), $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_0^L$ (respectively, $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F_1^L$) if and only if,

$$q_N^* \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - \Delta p - t_{NoN}) \quad \left(\text{respectively, } q_N^* \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - \Delta p - t_{NoN})\right) \tag{EC.45}$$

Note that every q_N^* that satisfies (EC.45) is an optimum answer since when $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$, $n_N = 0$ and q_N^* is of no importance. Also, note that $q_N \geq 0$. Thus, (EC.45) is true for at least one q_N^* if $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_{NoN}$ (respectively, $\Delta p \leq \kappa_u \tilde{q}_p - t_{NoN}$). The result follows. $\square$

The following lemma characterizes all the candidate answers when $x_N \geq 1$, and characterize the necessary condition on parameters for this solutions to be feasible.

LEMMA EC.16. *If $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$, i.e. optimum strategies are such that $x_N^* \geq 1$. Then $q_N^* = \tilde{q}_f$. Moreover, for all $x \in [0, \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_N + \Delta p)]$ and $\Delta p \geq t_N - \kappa_u \tilde{q}_f$, (q_N^*, x) constitutes an optimum solution in F^U.*

Proof: From (5), $x_N \geq 1$ is equivalent to:

$$\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N) \tag{EC.46}$$

Now, we prove the first result of the lemma. Note that from (5), if $x_N \geq 1$ then $n_N = 1$ and $n_{NoN} = 0$. In this case, the payoff of the CP is,

$$\pi_G = \kappa_{ad} q_N \tag{EC.47}$$

Note that the value of the payoff is independent of q_{NoN} as long as $n_N = 1$, and from (5), n_N is a function of q_N and q_{NoN}. In addition, note that if there exist a q_N that satisfies $\Delta p \geq t_N + \kappa_u (q_{NoN} - q_N)$, then $q_N' \geq q_N$ also satisfies this constraint. Therefore, for $q_N' \geq q_N$, $n_N = 1$ and (EC.47) is true. Note that (EC.47) is an increasing function of q_N. Thus, $q_N^* = \tilde{q}_f$ (using the feasible sets in Table 1 and their definitions).

Using (EC.46), $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$ if and only if:

$$q_{NoN}^* \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_u}(\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_N + \Delta p) \tag{EC.48}$$

Note that every q_{NoN}^* that satisfies (EC.48) is an optimum answer since when $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$, $n_{NoN}^* = 0$ and q_{NoN}^* is of no importance. Also, note that $q_{NoN} \geq 0$. Thus, the condition (EC.48) is true for at least one q_{NoN}^* if $\kappa_u \tilde{q}_f - t_N + \Delta p \geq 0$. The result follows. $\square$

COROLLARY EC.7. *If $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_0^L$, then $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_f)$. If $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F_1^L$, then $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (0, \tilde{q}_p)$. If $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) \in F^U$, then $(q_N^{eq}, q_{NoN}^{eq}) = (\tilde{q}_f, 0)$.*

Proof: Note that when $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^L$ (, respectively $(q_N^*, q_{NoN}^*) \in F^U$), then the payoff of the CP is independent of q_N^* and q_{NoN}^*. Thus, result of the corollary follows from Tie-Breaking Assumption 1. $\square$

THEOREM EC.2. *All possible equilibrium strategies are:*

$$\begin{aligned} &(0, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I \cup F_0^L \ , \ (\tilde{q}_f, 0) \in F_0^I \cup F_0^U \ , \ (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_f) \in F_0^I \ , \\ &(0, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I \cup F_1^L \ , \ (\tilde{q}_f, \tilde{q}_p) \in F_1^I \end{aligned} \tag{EC.49}$$

Results follow directly from Corollaries EC.6 and EC.7.

Note that (EC.49) and (EC.1) are exactly similar. This implies that the strategies chosen by the CP when she chooses from continuous sets is exactly similar to the strategies when she chooses from the discrete set characterized in our model. This completes our proof.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Rakesh Vohra, Professor of Economics & Electrical and Systems Engineering at the University of Pennsylvania, for many helpful comments.

Endnotes

1. Note that we are assuming that advertisements are quality-dependent. For example they are video or sound. Some examples of the CPs that provide these types of ads are YouTube and Spotify.

2. We assume a linear dependency between the quality and the advertising revenue and the cost. Thus, κ_{ad} can be considered to be $\kappa_{ad} = \kappa_{ad,rev} - \kappa_{ad,cost}$.

3. Although the new rules are not final yet, it is expected that non-neutrality would be accepted by the FCC only under extensive traffic monitoring by the FCC. This introduces an implicit cost for the ISPs.

4. Note that the utility of EUs connecting to ISP NoN is also decreasing with t_{NoN} (3). However, the rate of decrease in the utility of EUs connecting to ISP NoN (t_{NoN} is multiplies to a coefficient smaller than one) is lower than the rate of increase of the price of the neutral ISP (multiplied by one). Thus, overall, the number of EUs with the neutral (respectively, non-neutral) ISP is decreasing (respectively, increasing).

5. As we discussed, when both ISPs are active, the Internet connection fees are increasing with the transport costs. In other words, each ISP lock in some EUs and charge high Internet access fees to them.

6. Note that n_N and n_{NoN} are sum up to one. Thus, the effect of access fees on EUW is more than the effect of number of EUs with each ISP.

7. For example, the reason could be to prevent non-neutral ISPs from becoming monopoly or it could be the social pressure to preserve some neutrality in the market.

8. if not, then $\tilde{p}^{eq} \neq \tilde{p}_t$, since $\tilde{p}_t$ is not optimum.

9. Note that the payoff of NoN is equal to the maximum of the payoff when $\tilde{p}^{eq} = \tilde{p}_t$ and when $\tilde{p}^{eq} > \tilde{p}_t$, i.e. when $z^{eq} = 0$